21923

NATIONAL LIBRARY
OTTAWA

CANADA

BIBLIOTHÈQUE NATIONALE
OTTAWA

NAME OF AUTHOR RAPHAEL CHIANUMBA NWAMEFOR

TITLE OF THESIS AN INVESTIGATION OF CERTAIN ASPECTS OF CATALOGUING PRACTICE IN SEVEN WESTERN CANADIAN UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES.

UNIVERSITY UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA, EDMONTON

DEGREE FOR WHICH THESIS WAS PRESENTED MASTER OF LIBRARY SCIENCE

YEAR THIS DEGREE GRANTED 1974

Permission is hereby granted to THE NATIONAL LIBRARY OF CANADA to microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

(Signed) Ralph Nwamefor

PERMANENT ADDRESS:

NRI P.A.
AWKA DIVISION
EAST CENTRAL STATE
NIGERIA.

DATED 20th Dec. 1973

NL-91 (10-68)

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

AN INVESTIGATION OF CERTAIN ASPECTS OF CATALOGUING PRACTICE IN SEVEN WESTERN CANADIAN UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES

by

RAPHAEL CHIANUMBA NWAMEFOR

A THESIS
SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH
IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
MASTER OF LIBRARY SCIENCE

SCHOOL OF LIBRARY SCIENCE

EDMONTON, ALBERTA
FALL, 1974

© RAPHAEL CHIANUMBA NWAMEFOR 1975

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research for acceptance, a thesis entitled AN INVESTIGATION OF CERTAIN ASPECTS OF CATALOGUING PRACTICE IN SEVEN WESTERN CANADIAN UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES submitted by Raphael C. Nwamefor in partial fulfilment of the requirement for the degree of Master of Library Science.

. . W.E.P. Henderson . . .
(Supervisor)

. . Eileen M. Hoy . . .

. . Sheila Bertram . .

. . L.G. Wiedrick . . .

Date . 1 October 1974

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study is to identify and compare the cataloguing methods employed by seven selected Western Canadian university libraries to speed up the cataloguing of books. A survey of the literature indicated that both a decrease in cataloguing costs and an increase in bibliographic compatibility with Library of Congress cataloguing could be achieved by the use of unrevised LC copy. However, a time-lag still exists between the arrival of the book and of the LC cataloguing information. The study also identifies other techniques which speed up cataloguing by cutting down on repetitive activities.

The data for the study (Chapters three and four) were obtained from a questionnaire completed by each library, followed by interviewing, completion of a checklist and personal observation. The data collected dealt with the changes made in LC catalogue copy by the libraries surveyed and two main groups of cataloguing methods employed to speed up cataloguing.

The high percentage of original cataloguing done, and the existence of backlogs in the seven libraries, as well as the limitations of the Canadian Universities Shared Cataloguing Programme, suggest the need for a more embracing cooperative arrangement among large libraries across the country. The first part of the data (Chapter three) indicates developing areas of standardization; a prerequisite for effective cooperation.

The speed-up techniques identified may prove useful to other libraries concerned with moderating costs and at the same time more quickly meeting user needs.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author wishes to express his sincere thanks to the Chairman of his Thesis Committee, Prof. M.E.P. Henderson; his thesis supervisor, Dr. S. Bertram; and Prof. E. Hoy, all of the School of Library Science; and to Mr. Seno Laskowski, Chief Cataloguer in the Library, University of Alberta, for their assistance, encouragement and constructive criticism.

Appreciation is also expressed to all those who gave of their time, resources, patience and encouragement to assist in the completion of this thesis, especially the Canadian International Development Agency, whose sponsorship made it possible.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

INTRODUCTION 1

DEFINITIONS 3

CHAPTER I: 7

Background 7

Literature survey 9

CHAPTER II: 25

Methodology 25

CHAPTER III: 33

Findings: Changes made in LC cataloguing 33

General 33

Classification 36

Descriptive cataloguing 45

Subject cataloguing 55

CHAPTER IV: 60

Findings: Speed-up techniques in cataloguing 60

Use of LC copy in cataloguing 62

Quick cataloguing techniques 81

CHAPTER V: 101

Summary 101

Recommendations 107

Conclusion 117

BIBLIOGRAPHY 118

Page

APPENDIX 1: 125

Questionnaire 125

APPENDIX 2: 133

UC: Simplified cataloguing guide 133

APPENDIX 3: 135

UC: Preparing cataloguing copy 135

APPENDIX 4: 137

Canadian Universities Shared Cataloguing Programme: Statistics 137

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	DESCRIPTION	PAGE
2-1	Random number selection pattern	27
3-1	Total library collection related to cataloguing staff	33
3-2	Major areas of modification to the LC classification	35
3-3	Changes in call numbers	42
3-4	Changes in main entries	49
3-5	Preliminary pages	50
3-6	Changes in added entries	57
4-1	Average number of titles catalogued per person per month	60
4-2	Source of catalogue cards	62
4-3	Forms of LC copy in use	65
4-4	MARC use compared with other forms of cataloguing at US (1972)	72

INTRODUCTION

The functions of a university may be described as the transmission and extension of knowledge. The university library directs its activities toward the fulfilment of these functions by accumulating, organizing and making available books, manuscripts, journals and other materials.

The division of university libraries into functional departments has not followed a uniform pattern. Tradition, personnel, physical arrangements, financial considerations, curricula, types of collections, and the personalities and attitudes of administrative officers, all account for variations. In recent years, there has been increasing experimentation with departmental organization, and it is likely that this will continue. The large number of variables, however, renders generalizations regarding a preferred departmental organization difficult, if not impossible. In the majority of large university libraries, departmental organization revolves around the functional units. Two of the major functional groupings of library activities are acquisitions and cataloguing, normally subdivisions of technical service operations.

The cataloguing department prepares and maintains the records which reveal the holdings of the library. The major operations involved in this preparation consist of descriptive cataloguing, subject cataloguing and classification. Since most cataloguing departments combine the cataloguing and classifying operations, cataloguing and classification are often referred to as, simply, 'cataloguing', and this study will follow that practice. Where only one definite aspect of the three operations is concerned, however, the relevant specific term will be used.

Descriptive cataloguing refers to the making of entries which provide distinguishing bibliographical information for every item in the collection. The classification function is directed toward an orderly arrangement within subject groups of the materials being processed. Classification and subject cataloguing represent efforts to display the contents of the library's holdings. The cataloguing department, ordinarily, has the responsibility for cataloguing and classifying books, periodicals, newspapers, other serials, pamphlets, documents, manuscripts as well as non-book materials of all sorts. The product of the department consists of necessary records for the public catalogue, the official catalogue, the shelf list, library catalogues for other departments and any other locally required catalogues. The department may also have the responsibility for maintaining a union catalogue of cards received from various cooperating libraries.

DELIMITATION

This study deals with the cataloguing of books only, a book being taken as a printed and published monograph of at least forty-nine pages excluding its cover pages. Serials are excluded, as are government publications.

DEFINITIONS

Cataloguing practice comprehends descriptive cataloguing, subject cataloguing and classification. This may vary from library to library and, within an individual library, from time to time.

LC is the abbreviated form for the Library of Congress at Washington, D. C., which is responsible among other things for the production and distribution of cataloguing copy, rules and services in the United States. In this study the abbreviation will refer, essentially, to the cataloguing copy provided.

Title II-C: By Title II, Part C, of the United States Higher Education Act of 1965, funds were transferred by Congress to the Librarian of Congress for the purpose of: i) acquiring, so far as possible, all library materials currently published throughout the world which are of value to scholarship; and ii) providing catalogue information for these materials promptly after receipt, distributing bibliographic information by printing catalogue cards or by other means, and iii) enabling the Library of Congress to use for exchange and other purposes such of these materials as are not needed for its own collections.

The Act provides for three activities: a) the Library of Congress is authorized to become globally comprehensive in acquiring currently-published materials of scholarly interest; b) a bibliographic record is to be created for these titles shortly after receipt (that is, within three to four weeks) and c) this bibliographic record is to be distributed by printed catalogue cards or by other means.

By this action Congress: i) fully recognized, for the first time, the importance of granting federal aid and assistance toward solving the problem of cataloguing in the United States; and ii) gave the Library of Congress a clear mandate to provide new and unparalleled services for the benefit of academic and research libraries.

NPAC stands for the National Program for Acquisitions and Cataloging, which arose out of Title II-C activities.

MARC (acronym for 'Machine-Readable Cataloguing') is a subscription service which provides weekly issues of magnetic tape, containing bibliographic description and classification in machine-readable form, for all English language monographs currently catalogued at the Library of Congress. Monographs in other languages are being gradually incorporated. MARC I refers to the feasibility study for the project, and MARC II to its current operational phase.

FASTCAT is a temporary cataloguing technique. It is mainly designed to make new books immediately available to readers pending the receipt of cataloguing copy, when the books will be given full cataloguing. In FASTCAT, each book is given a temporary book identification number which may be labelled on the spine, and by which the book is shelved. Some libraries use broad subject classification symbols for this purpose, numbering serially within the broad subject, so that books shelve in broad subject groups. Others simply use book accession numbers so that books shelve in one sequence, according to their order of arrival, irrespective of their subject area. Since the numbering, either way, is in chronological order, it is a simple matter to identify those books for which copy has not been received after a predetermined time, so that they may be given original cataloguing.

Cataloging-In-Source (CIS) was the first practical experiment meant to deal comprehensively with the problem of providing cataloguing information for books promptly and economically, by including this information as an integral part of the book itself. This was conducted from June 1958 to February 1959 by the Library of Congress, making use of printers' page proofs, obtained from publishers for this purpose. By the end of the experiment, more than half the entries proved to be accurate. In the remaining entries, almost half the collation statements required adjustments. The Library of Congress stopped the project because, according to its report, the experiment to that point showed that the underlying purpose to ascertain whether a permanent full scale programme could be justified in terms of financing, technical considerations and utility, could not be met. But librarians remained very eager for this service.

Cataloging In Publication (CIP), which was begun in July 1971, again by the Library of Congress, is substantially the same programme as Cataloging-In-Source of 1958/59, except that the time allowed for cataloguing by the Library of Congress has been extended from twenty-four hours to one week. To gain this extra time, several elements considered to be easily obtainable by cataloguers in libraries were omitted from the CIP entry. These elements have to be furnished by the local library when the book is received. Under the CIP proposal, publishers send complete sets of galley proofs, rather than page proofs, as galleys are produced at a considerably earlier stage in the publishing cycle. In the earlier CIS experiment, the greatest number of errors occurred in the collation, followed by the imprint, and it was decided that both elements would be among those to be omitted from the CIP entry.

Proofslips. Proof sheets resulting from running new LC card copy on sheets of paper, five cards per sheet, may be purchased from the Library of Congress. Proofslips are the sheets cut into card size.

CHAPTER I

BACKGROUND

Two basic problems librarians have been trying to solve for over a century, are: reducing the high cost of cataloguing operations, and the shortening of the time that elapses between the publication of a book and its availability to the patron. Of the studies that have been done, the emphasis has been primarily on the costs involved rather than on the time factor which, in itself, means money. It was hoped a solution of the above problems might lie in the sale of printed cards, pioneered (1893) by the Library Bureau, taken over later (1897) by the American Library Association, and, subsequently (1901), by the Library of Congress.

Throughout the twentieth century, the Library of Congress has held a dominant position in cataloguing in the English-speaking world. The recent increase in its cataloguing coverage of the world's publishing output and the increasing tendency on the part of academic libraries to use, with less and less change, LC data have given Library of Congress cataloguing its primacy in cataloguing services.

As it has never made national borders a barrier to the distribution of its cataloguing copy, many Canadian libraries have long taken advantage of the cataloguing information supplied, directly or indirectly, by the Library of Congress, as a means of reducing the amount of costly original cataloguing and professional decision-making required in their own catalogue departments. The main benefits consist of the provision by the Library of Congress of cataloguing copy, either on proofslips or in the multi-volume sets of its printed catalogue, carrying the LC (and now, also, the Dewey and National Library of Medicine) call number, LC descriptive cataloguing and subject headings, and the maintenance service provided to keep both its classification schedules and subject heading list suitably contemporary. And so, despite the fact that the Library of Congress is primarily an American governmental library, large libraries the world over have found it advantageous to use its services.

The existence of Canadiana as a source of cataloguing copy, has brought notably fewer practical benefits:

i) restricted to Canadian items, and starting only in 1950, its scope cannot begin to compare with the (currently) 250,000 titles yearly from all over the world, covered by the Library of Congress seventy-five-year-old service;

ii) Canadiana entries are available in proofslip but not catalogue card stock and have only just begun to appear (October 1973) in machine-readable form.

iii) an entry in Canadiana normally follows by some weeks, or even months, the acquisition of a title by most Canadian libraries - by which time they have had to catalogue the item themselves, individually.

LITERATURE SURVEY

Cost Studies.

In 1925, the Catalog Section of the American Library Association drew up a "Plan for an investigation into, and a report on, the cost of cataloging,"[1] which contained a detailed list of cataloguing activities to be measured. Nothing was done with this list, as funds were not available to sponsor further study. In 1936, Miller[2] analyzed cataloguing costs and time involved, at the University of Iowa Library, and many other college and university libraries followed his pattern, testing, and then establishing, minimum standards of production within their cataloguing departments.

Reports, nearly thirty years later, indicated that the issue was still one of grave concern to librarians. Berkowitz[3] published, in 1961, a comparative study of the costs of cataloguing books, using LC catalogue cards versus original cataloguing methods, and estimated that it cost almost 27¢ more per card to produce by original cataloguing.

---

[1] American Library Association. Catalog Section. "Papers and proceedings of the forty-seventh annual meeting," American Library Association Bulletin, XIX (July, 1925), pp. 278-86.

[2] Robert A. Miller, "Cost accounting for libraries; a technique for determining the labor cost of acquisitions and cataloging work," Library Quarterly, VII (October, 1937), pp. 511-36

[3] Albert Berkowitz, "A study of the costs of cataloging books with Library of Congress catalog cards and by original cataloging methods," College and Research Libraries, XXIV (March, 1963), pp. 126-30.

Skipper,[4] Executive Secretary of the [American] Association of Research Libraries (ARL), in his 1966 introduction to 'Characteristics of cataloging in research libraries', estimated that it was costing from two to five times as much to catalogue a book independently as it did to perform this operation with good catalogue copy available. His speech, the next year, before the International Federation of Library Associations (IFLA), clearly showed that the ARL had become deeply concerned over the situation:

> "The Association of Research Libraries accepted the principle that it was economically wasteful, socially unjustifiable, and professionally irresponsible for the greater majority of books entering their collections to be cataloged more than once."[5]

Although, the Association's Board of Directors was already well aware of the difficulties inherent in a programme to improve the availability of catalogue copy, it was evident that the economy of the research library community could no longer tolerate the existing situation.

Thus, at the sixty-third meeting of the Association, in January 1965,[6] the Board recommended that the Association give the highest priority during the next few years to developing a programme for decreasing the amount of original cataloguing, working in conjunction with representatives of the Library of Congress and other library groups. This was, in view of the substantial cost of cataloguing in research libraries, the rising percentage of original cataloguing that was necessary (47 libraries reported an average of 46 per cent original cataloguing required in 1963), and the increasing arrearages of uncatalogued materials (the same reporting libraries indicated that their arrearage increased at an average of 160 per cent during the previous ten years).

---

[4] James E. Skipper, "The characteristics of cataloging in research libraries," Association of Research Libraries. Minutes of the Sixty-eighth Meeting. (New York City, July 9, 1966), pp. 55-83.

[5] James E. Skipper, "International implications of the shared Cataloging Program; introductory statement," Libri, XVII (1967), p. 273.

[6] Skipper, "The characteristics of cataloging in research libraries," loc. cit., p. 55.

During the Association's discussion of the issue, it was pointed out that the ARL libraries were spending around $18 million each year for cataloguing and had over 1.2 million volumes in uncatalogued arrearage. Given the exponential growth of library collections, these figures would grow to truly unmanageable proportions, and the concerned institutions required a solution to this problem. The membership of the ARL, therefore, unanimously endorsed the recommendation of the Board, and a Shared Cataloging Committee was formed.[7] The Committee consulted with the Library of Congress, and the proposal resulted in the formation of the Library of Congress National Program for Acquisitions and Cataloging and Regional Acquisitions. Ishimoto[8] has recently studied the impact of NPAC on university libraries and discovered that the programme has had a significant beneficial effect on the university libraries she surveyed. She has no doubt that this programme, with the budget cuts experienced by most libraries in recent years, had contributed a great deal towards reducing cataloguing costs, and increasing bibliographic compatibility with the Library of Congress. Elrod[9] had, earlier, conducted a similar survey of a similar programme - 'A Canadian program of shared cataloguing' - among certain academic libraries in Canada. He considered the experience in cooperation and some reduction of backlogs as gains. But with the refunding of the NPAC uncertain each year, the main value of the Canadian programme is seen as the insurance it offers should the American programme (NPAC) be drastically curtailed.

---

[7] Ibid., p. 56.

[8] Carol Ishimoto, "The National Program for Acquisitions and Cataloging: its impact on university libraries," College and Research Libraries, XXXIV (March, 1973), pp. 126-36.

Fasana and Fall,[10] in an article on the processing costs for science monographs in the Columbia University Libraries, reported the average cost per volume as $10.26. Raymond and Francis,[11] discussing whether Canadian universities should do their own cataloguing or use LC copy, concluded that whereas in the past the answer to this question was an inevitable 'yes' to local cataloguing, by 1968 the answer was not so certain because of the Library of Congress Shared Cataloging and Acquisition Program. The article adds that the cost of cataloguing, in research libraries, was by then approximately 16 per cent of total library operating expenditures. Bregzis, at the University of Toronto, made a salary cost study for LC copy cataloguing versus original cataloguing, in 1968/69. His figures included descriptive cataloguing, subject analysis and classification. The results indicated that, at Toronto, the cost of original cataloguing was nearly four times greater than LC copy cataloguing.[12] Hewitt and Rebuldela,[13] in a report of the feasibility studies and development of the Colorado Academic Libraries Book Processing Centre, gave the charges for the Centre's products as: $1.85 for titles previously processed by the Centre; $2.35 for titles with LC copy, but for which a CALBPC master file card has not yet been prepared, and $3.95 for original cataloguing. This illustrates the significant savings involved in libraries using LC copy for their cataloguing.

---

[9] J. McRee Elrod, "A Canadian program of shared cataloguing," Canadian Library Journal, XXVIII (May, 1971), pp. 222-24.

[10] Paul J. Fasana and James E. Fall, "Processing costs for science monographs in the Columbia University Libraries," Library Resources and Technical Services, XI (Winter, 1967), p. 114.

[11] Boris Raymond and Derek Francis, "Is this trip really necessary? or should university libraries do their own cataloguing?," Canadian Library, XXV (July, 1968), pp. 35-37.

Time Studies.

While administrators may be mainly concerned with the high percentage of the budget that goes into technical services, librarians and library users are more concerned with the long wait for a book to be prepared for use. Fundamentally, the wants of any library users are easily stated: they want material when they need, or first become aware of it. Especially for those libraries that use the Library of Congress system as a base for their cataloguing practice -

---

[12] Carol Ishimoto, op. cit., p. 129.

[13] Joe A. Hewitt and Harriet K. Rebuldela, "The Colorado Academic Book Processing Centre," Louisiana Library Association Bulletin, XXXIV (Summer, 1971), p. 50.

and all the Canadian universities covered in this study do - a considerable length of time can be saved by using LC cataloguing information.

Time study involves both the cataloguing time and the lag time; that is, both the time it takes to process a book using either original or copy cataloguing, and the time-lag when a cataloguer decides to wait for the cataloguing copy for this purpose. A closer reflection on the time-lag problem as it applies specifically to using LC cataloguing shows that at least two distinct time periods are involved: the first is the interval between the publication of a book and the production of the cataloguing information by the Library of Congress; the second, the lag between the production of this LC cataloguing information and the availability of this information at the individual library requiring it for cataloguing.

The advent of printed LC cards did not significantly affect this time-lag problem, because of delays in the Copyright Office; hence the series of subsequent centralized and cooperative efforts made mainly by the Library of Congress in conjunction with other large libraries, to solve this problem. These efforts have been well covered by Pope,[14] who also cited Greer[15] (1961), the Denver

---

[14] S. Elspeth Pope, The time-lag in cataloging. (Metuchen, N.J.: The Scarecrow Press, 1973), pp. 31-46.

[15] Roger C. Greer, The current United States national book bibliography: an analysis of coverage with recommendations for improvement. (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Rutgers University, 1964), Table XIV, p. 76.

Studies[16] (1967), Leonard, Maier and Dougherty[17] (1967), and the Angold Studies,[18] to substantiate the existence of this time-lag problem.

Morrison and Morrison[19] concluded in an empirical investigation of the use of LC classification decisions in academic libraries, that their study supported the contention that local libraries can - and do - save a great deal of time and effort, as a result of the Library of Congress making its classification decisions available to other libraries. Not only the statistical data, but also the opinions of the librarians involved, point to the conclusion that newer libraries, such as those of the state colleges surveyed by the Morrisons, have tended to accept a large proportion of the classification information supplied by the Library of Congress with a resultant increase in the efficiency of the classification process; nor did this acceptance reveal any evidence of a loss in the service rendered by the libraries. Berkowitz concluded,[20] in his comparative cost study, that, presuming a library received materials in an appreciable quantity requiring original cataloguing, ordering LC cards whenever they were available would release the time of professional cataloguers to perform original work.

---

[16] Barbara Aro, ed., Cost analysis study: Technical Services Division, University of Denver Library. (Denver, Col., University of Denver, Graduate School of Librarianship, 1967), p. 53.

[17] Lawrence E. Leonard, Joan M. Maier and Richard M. Dougherty, Centralized book processing: a feasibility study based on Colorado Academic Libraries. (Metuchen, N.J.: The Scarecrow Press, 1969), p. 78.

[18] Linda Angold. Cost and time analysis of monograph cataloging in hospital libraries: a preliminary study. Report No. 51, (Detroit, Mich., Wayne State University. School of Medicine. Library and Biomedical Information Service Centre, 1969), Table 1, p. 15.

[19] Perry Morrison and Catherine Morrison, "Use of Library of Congress classification decisions in academic libraries; an empirical study," Library Resources and Technical Services, IX (Spring, 1965), pp. 235-42.

With professional cataloguers thus concentrating on material that must be locally catalogued, there would be a better chance of keeping up with the work load. Writing on the problem of LC cataloguing, Melcher,[21] using 1968 figures, showed an average 40-day gap between the receipt of a new book at Bowker[22] and the receipt of its cataloguing information. He further revealed that high-priority titles were taking 11 days to go through the cataloguing process at the Library of Congress, and 14 days to go through the printing and distribution process - a total of 25 days. For other books, the cataloguing time averaged 35-1/2 days, and the printing distribution process took longer. It took the Library of Congress 7 extra days to fill orders for its cards, once they became available, and only about 60 per cent of the cards being ordered were supplied in the first shipment. Taking this at its face value, it seems clear that even the high-priority books were averaging 32 days, from receipt of book [at the Library of Congress] to first shipment of finished cards, which means that half of them took longer than 32 days. Hellen[23] conducted an inquiry into Library of Congress cataloguing delays, concluding that the problem lay in alleviating the printing backlog. The solution he offered to this was a decentralization of the process which agreed with Pope's chapter on 'Sharing the load'.[24]

---

[20] Berkowitz, "A study of the costs of cataloging books with Library of Congress catalog cards and by original cataloging methods," loc. cit., p. 130.

[21] Daniel Melcher and Margaret Saul, Melcher on acquisition, (Chicago: American Library Association, 1971), pp. 131-32.

[22] Bowker is a United States publishing company of which Melcher was director.

Nitecki[25] recorded that his cataloguing editor (a sub-professional) could process approximately 250 to 300 titles per week, or, roughly, five times as many titles as could be expected of the professional cataloguer processing original non-LC material. This again confirmed that there may be significant saving in time by using LC copy. In her survey already referred to, Ishimoto[26] reported four university libraries that have swung over to the use of LC classification schedules since 1966 - Yale (1969), Pennyslvania (1967), Columbia (1966), North Carolina (1966) - and at least eight others prior to that date, in order to expedite processing with LC copy, and to take advantage of the increase in the number of NPAC/LC cards. In two of the largest libraries she surveyed, it was estimated that titles with LC copy required about half the length of time to catalogue taken by those without. At another library, the ratio seemed to be three titles with LC copy to one title catalogued originally. Johnson,[27] at UCLA, reported that cataloguing by nonprofessional LC copy cataloguers averaged 20 minutes per title while original cataloguing by professional cataloguers averaged 45 minutes. Pope's study[28] afforded the most penetrating insight into the time-lag problem: its major purpose was to ascertain if a time-lag existed for American libraries (and Canadian libraries, too) between the publication of a book and the date the cataloguing information became available to a library. The second part of that study was designed to suggest a way to eliminate this time-lag. Her findings confirmed that a time-lag did exist, and that Cataloging In Publication was the only feasible solution to the problem of providing prompt cataloguing information. To speed up this programme further, she suggested that the Library of Congress accept the descriptive cataloguing prepared by the publisher on the same basis as it accepted descriptive catalog[illegible] prepared under the Shared Cataloging arrangement.

---

[23] George B. Hellen, Jr., "An inquiry into Library of Congress cataloging delays," Library Resources and Technical Services, XV (Summer, 1971), pp. 364-79.

[24] Pope, The time-lag in cataloging, pp. 134-60.

[25] Joseph Z. Nitecki, "Speed cataloging: prudence and pitfalls; a report on two years of successful experience in streamlining the cataloging of materials at a major academic library," Library Journal, XCIV (April 1, 1969), pp. 1417-21.

[26] Ishimoto, "The National Program for Acquisitions and Cataloging," loc. cit., p. 128.

Under Title II-C, the [illegible]ed with distributing the bibliographic [illegible] printed catalogue cards, but by such other mea[illegible] copy.

---

[27] Ibid., pp. 128-29.

[28] Pope, The time-lag in cataloging, passim.

The MARC project, begun the same year as the Library of Congress Shared Cataloging Program, was designed as a means of disseminating cataloguing information in a form more suited to the various libraries. Inaugurated on March 27, 1969, when the first weekly computer tapes were mailed to subscribers, the MARC Project grew out of the conviction of many librarians that automation was becoming necessary if libraries were to keep up with the rising tide of new materials and the mounting demand for rapid information. Since the Library of Congress has no control, other than persuasion, over the tempo of the cooperating agencies upon which it depends, and may not be able to accelerate greatly its own processing of the data, once received (both facts are well developed in Pope's analysis of LC's efforts),[29] the greatest possibilities for improvement lay, and still lie, in the distribution of the information. It was hoped that the early availability from the Library of Congress of machine-readable bibliographic data for current materials, as a by-product of the Library of Congress cataloguing operations, would be desirable, and would help libraries as they approach automated systems. Melcher sums up the reversion to Cataloging In Publication:

> "The very fact that cataloging-in-source is again being discussed seems a tacit admission that automation isn't expected to solve the [time-lag] problem after all."[30]

There has been only one published study, so far, dealing with the time-lag in the MARC programme and the proofslips. It was carried out by Payne and McGee,[31] at the University of Chicago, and its purpose was to determine the speed of MARC records, in comparison with the arrival dates of 5,020 LC proofslips. The study revealed that four-fifths of the titles of the MARC records were received the same week as, or earlier than, the proofslips. While this study established the fact that MARC records arrived in many cases a week earlier than the proofslips, it also showed that MARC did not really offer a solution to the time-lag (nor is this the main purpose of MARC) as it reduces by one week only the lapsed time between the publication of a book and the availability of cataloguing information. The time-lag, in this area, is clearly not the responsibility of the MARC programme to solve, since the information cannot be entered onto the MARC tape until the book has been catalogued by the Library of Congress. The entering of the bibliographic information on MARC must await the book being acquired and catalogued by the Library of Congress, and the copy must be prepared for the Printing Office before it can be sent to the MARC Office. Apart from automation cost, one other obvious handicap in the use of MARC in research libraries, has been its limitation to English language materials. It was only recently that French and German were included.

---

[29] Ibid., pp. 110-33.

[30] Melcher, Melcher on Acquisition, p. 127.

A detailed background to the two pre-publication cataloguing operations - Cataloging-In-Source and Cataloging In Publication - is provided by Wheeler, Clapp and Welsh,[32] in the text of materials presented at the Program Meeting on Cataloging In Publication held by the Resources and Technical Services Division of the American Library Association at its annual conference in Detroit, July 1, 1970. Wheeler and Clapp put up a case for CIP, while Welsh presented a report on Library of Congress' plans for the project. Bernhardt[33] had earlier, in 1963, written a thesis on CIS, at the Graduate Library School of the University of Pittsburgh, and on September 15, 1969, there appeared Wheeler's forceful article, "Top priority for Cataloging-In-Source."[34] A study of the development of the CIP project was also partly covered by Ishimoto's study[35] as a parallel programme of NPAC for United States publication, while its more recent advances have been presented in the periodic 'Cataloging In Publication' Progress Reports,[36] issued by the Processing Department of the Library of Congress.

---

[31] Charles T. Payne and Robert S. McGee, "Comparisons of LC proofslip and MARC tape arrival dates at the University of Chicago Library," Journal of Library Automation, III (June, 1970), pp. 115-17.

---

[32] Joseph L. Wheeler, Verner W. Clapp and William J. Welsh, "Cataloging in/at Source," Library Resources and Technical Services, XV (Winter, 1971), pp. 6-27.

[33] Homer Ivan Bernhardt, A treatise on Cataloging in Source, (unpublished Master's thesis, Graduate Library School, University of Pittsburgh, 1963).

[34] Joseph L. Wheeler, "Top priority for Cataloging-In-Source," Library Journal, XCIV (September 15, 1969), pp. 3007-13.

[35] Ishimoto, "The National Program for Acquisitions and Cataloging," loc. cit., p. 135.

[36] U.S. Library of Congress. Processing Department. Cataloging In Publication Progress Report, No. 1- , 1972- .

Until CIP is widely adopted, and cataloguers may depend on its service, as they have hitherto depended on NPAC and other forms of copy, some other cataloguing techniques or methods of making material immediately available for use will be indispensable to the effort of cataloguers in overcoming the time problem, while at the same time keeping down cataloguing costs.

Other methods of speed-up cataloguing.

Piternick,[37] while arguing that a certain degree of delay in university library processing might be necessary, advanced as one of the reasons for such a delay, the fact that it would increase the amount of LC cataloguing available. But it is exactly this kind of practice that Melcher decried as a stumbling block to the effectiveness of blanket order plans:

> "One of the most frequently cited advantages of the blanket order plans is their speed. This comes ... from not waiting for reviews .... The advantages of speed are, however, what you make of them. In a situation where books are normally held out of use until the arrival of LC catalog cards, more speed might just amount to a policy of 'hurry up and wait'.[38]

But Piternick's contention was not merely theoretical. Ishimoto[39] in her survey, reported that in order to optimize the utilization of NPAC/LC cards, the majority of the university libraries she covered have developed systematic deferred cataloguing procedures for current materials with imprint dates for the current year and (generally) two preceding years. This waiting period for LC copy was justified for two basic reasons: cataloguing costs were reduced, and bibliographic compatibility with LC was achieved. Nixon and Bell[40] depicted a similar situation, at UCLA Library, having noted that in an effort to speed materials to the user, while allowing a maturation period in order to take full advantage of the NPAC, many libraries were making their newly-acquired materials available in a public area for circulation before cataloguing. The report of these libraries again confirmed that nearly all large research libraries were holding up much of their current acquisitions by some method in order to maximize their return on Library of Congress Shared Cataloging (NPAC) copy. Member libraries of the Association of Research Libraries (ARL) have found that a maturation period of from twelve to eighteen months may yield as high as ninety per cent LC copy. But here Nixon and Bell raise the same problem which had been earlier posed and answered by both Piternick and Ishimoto: the problem of how to make uncatalogued materials available to readers while awaiting the arrival of cataloguing copy.

---

[37] George Piternick, "University library arrearages," Library Resources and Technical Services, XIII (Winter, 1969), pp. 102-14.

[38] Melcher, Melcher on Acquisition, pp. 112-13.

[39] Ishimoto, "The National Program for Acquisitions and Cataloging," loc. cit., p. 130.

Gore[41] has been primarily identified with 'fast cataloging', although he did, in his celebrated article, acknowledge the original idea as Scilken's,[42] whom he dubbed 'the father of fast cataloging'. Essentially, the whole technique fitted Melcher's description of "hurry up and wait", for Gore agreed that its effect was to "speed up your cataloguing by slowing it down." Even at that, its effect in getting new materials immediately on arrival to users remains its big attraction to libraries.

---

[40] Roberta Nixon and Ray Bell, "The UCLA Catalog Supplement," Library Resources and Technical Services, XVII (Winter, 1973), pp. 28-31.

[41] Daniel Gore, "In hot pursuit of FASTCAT," Library Journal, XCVII (September 1, 1972), pp. 2693-95.

---

[42] Marvin H. Scilken, "Backlog to frontlog: a scheme for circulating nonfiction books without the help of LC," Library Journal, XCIV (September 15, 1969), pp. 3014-15.

CHAPTER II

METHODOLOGY

AIMS

The two aims of the study were:

1. To find out what changes are made in LC catalogue copy by the university libraries surveyed.

2. To identify and compare the various cataloguing methods employed by the libraries to speed up the cataloguing of their material, as compared with the use of National Union Catalog copy in all its forms - monthly, quarterly, annual or any other cumulation, or purchase of LC printed cards.

SAMPLES

The libraries of the universities of Alberta, British Columbia, Calgary, Saskatchewan at Saskatoon, Saskatchewan at Regina, Simon Fraser, and Victoria were surveyed for the purpose of this study. Well-established insitutions, each offering postgraduate courses, these libraries were presumed to have adequately structured and formalized cataloguing practices. Hereafter, any mention of any of the above institutions, in this study, should be taken to refer to its library, and more specifically, to its cataloguing division, or cataloguing practice. In such references, the names of the universities, will be given in the following shortened forms:

UA will stand for the University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta.

UBC will stand for the University of British Columbia, Vancouver, British Columbia.

UC will stand for the University of Calgary, Calgary, Alberta.

USR will stand for the University of Saskatchewan, Regina Campus, Regina, Saskatchewan.

US will stand for the University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon Campus, Saskatoon, Saskatchewan.

SFU will stand for Simon Fraser University, Burnaby, British Columbia.

UV will stand for the University of Victoria, Victoria, British Columbia.

DATA COLLECTION

Part One: The Checklist.

A checklist of 200 titles, chosen from Choice,[1] was drawn up. Photocopies of titles, as catalogued by the Library of Congress, were made, and separately mounted and filed, as the basis of comparison with the practice in each library, as indicated by the catalogue cards in each library's public catalogue.

A random sample of numbers was first taken.[2] Using a factor of +3, a total of 250 numbers was initially selected, in the pattern shown in Table 2-1. Those numbers occurring twice in the samples obtained - 366, 514, 1917, 5048, 6063 and 7891 - were used only once. This brought the overall total of numbers realized down to 244.

These numbers were next arranged in strict numerical sequence. The selection of titles from Choice was then started with the title

---

[1] Choice; books for college libraries, Association of College and Research Libraries, v. 1, no. 1-   . March, 1964-   .

[2] Donald B. Owen, Handbook of statistical tables, (Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1962), p. 519.

TABLE 2-1

RANDOM NUMBER SELECTION PATTERN

Row	Column
1	1
4	4
7	7
10	10
13	3
16	6
19	9
22	2
25	5
28	8
etc.	etc.

corresponding to the smallest number in the sample, by a simple count of the titles in Choice, beginning with Choice VII (1970/71) which starts with titles for March, 1970. Each entry that corresponded with a number yielded by the random sample was ticked. At the end of Volume 7, there were still 95 random numbers to be matched with Choice titles, and since continuing into Volume 8 of Choice (March 1971 - September 1972) would have meant the inclusion of titles too recent for the libraries to have acquired and catalogued, a decision was taken to work backwards to Choice VI (1969-1970) continuing the counting and ticking systematically backwards from February 1971 in Volume 7, towards February 1970 and earlier. The last of the 95 remaining numbers was matched, in Choice VI, page 904, with a title published in September, 1969. Only the regular Choice listings (usually annotated) were counted; advertisements and similar boxed inclusions were not included in the count.

Each ticked title was next identified, by means of a compound number, for easier reference. The first part of this compound number was obtained from a serial numbering of all the 250 titles, in the order in which the random numbers were taken from the statistical table. This meant that the number obtained from Row one, Column one, became Number one. The other part of this compound number was the actual random number each title represented, so that 'Title 116-1716', for example, indicates that this is the matching title for the 116th number in the order of random number, as well as the 1716th title taken from the count through Choice.

A search for the LC copy from the Micrographic Catalog Retrieval Service microfiche for the 244 titles selected, yielded 212 hits. The last 12 hits, in the order of random numbers (these lay between 239 and 250) were eliminated, leaving 200 titles, as catalogued by the Library of Congress, for the first part of this study.

Part Two.

a) Related readings on the practices of the universities were discovered mainly by searching library literature and the issues of the following journals, identified as regular sources of relevant articles on Canadian university libraries: Canadian Library Journal, Technical Sidelights, Canadian Assoication of College and University

Libraries (CACUL) Newsletter, College and Research Libraries, and Library Resources and Technical Services (although the two last ones are primarily American in content). References from these to other sources were also pursued.

Following the literature review, a questionnaire, interviews, and personal observation, were the instruments used in collecting the required data for this part of the study. Readings were also undertaken, at this stage, on the questionnaire and questionnaire techniques, as well as on interviews and interview techniques.

b) A detailed questionnaire (of 31 questions - see Appendix I) was drawn up, to yield information on the various cataloguing methods of the universities, any speed-up procedures they might use and any changes made in the Library of Congress schemes. This questionnaire was influenced by those of Fernekes,[3] for his survey of United States Southeastern college libraries, and Friedman and Jeffreys,[4] in their survey of cataloguing and classification practices and procedures in British university libraries.

The questionnaire was pre-tested in Edmonton, using the cataloguers of Edmonton Public Library, Grant McEwan Community College Library, and The Northern Alberta Institute of Technology Library. It was then modified, in the light of problems raised by these cataloguers, both in their understanding of the questions and the answers provided.

---

[3] Robert William Fernekes, "Survey of cataloging in selected Southeastern college libraries," Research paper. (George Peabody College for Teachers, 1971), pp. 71-74.

[4] Joan Friedman and Allan Jeffreys, Cataloguing and classification in British university libraries: a survey of practices and procedures. (Sheffield: Sheffield University, Postgraduate School of Librarianship, 1967), pp. 29-37.

Copies of the questionnaire in its final form were then mailed to the seven university libraries in the sample and a 100 per cent response was realised. Six of the libraries, in addition to information supplied in the questionnaire response, also enclosed additional materials as requested, which helped to illustrate their respective practices. The remaining library made its extra materials available during the on-site visit to the institution.

c) An interview schedule was drawn up for each library, based on the questionnaire response, the supplementary materials supplied by the libraries, and the related readings done by the investigator. It also included questions considered more appropriate for an interview than for the questionnaire. Though certain questions were common to every interview, most of the questions had to depend on what each library was doing and what it supplied in response to the questionnaire. The interview schedule, in each case, particularly the part investigating the backlog of the different libraries, drew on Piternick's[5] questionnaire for his survey of processing arrearages in American and Canadian university libraries.

d) Each library in the sample was visited in July 1973, to apply both the interview schedule and the 200-title checklist, and an average of four days was spent at each institution, when interviews were held with members of each cataloguing department. In all the libraries the head of the cataloguing department was the focus of the interview. Each visit included a tour of the cataloguing operations, and was usually followed by excursions into such related library activities as acquisitions, physical book preparation, catalogue organization and general public service of the library.

---

[5] George Piternick, "University library arrearages," Library Resources and Technical Services, XIII (Winter, 1969), pp. 102-14.

Both interviews and site surveys attempted to meet the following objectives:

i) Clarification of imprecise or incomplete data submitted in the questionnaire.

ii) Provision of data on certain points not covered by the questionnaire and realized to be of possible significance or interest in the study.

iii) Securing an understanding and a "feel" of the cataloguing operation and routines, including the nature and complexity of the cataloguing tasks in general and, specifically, attempts at speed-up cataloguing.

iv) Gaining a more extensive insight than that obtainable in the questionnaire concerning the problem of a backlog and attempts at its solution.

v) Affording an opportunity for the participating libraries to bring to light pertinent features of their practice within the study objectives which had not been elicited by the questionnaire, and to suggest modifications of or additions to this study.

Each interview took an average of two and a half hours and the rest of the time at each institution was spent at the public catalogue working on the Checklist. This involved comparing the library's entry with the LC copy, noting on the blank sheets bearing the mounted LC copy any differences between the library's cataloguing practice and that of the Library of Congress. Particular attention was paid to the degree of identity with LC in descriptive cataloguing, classification and subject heading work, but every significant difference was noted during the checking.

CHAPTER III

FINDINGS: CHANGES MADE IN LC CATALOGUING

TABLE 3-1

TOTAL LIBRARY COLLECTION RELATED TO CATALOGUING STAFF

Library	Extent of Collection	Professional Cataloguing Staff	Non-Professional Cataloguing Staff	Total	Ratio
UBC	1,643,364	17	93	110	1:5.5
UA	1,414,264	22	66	88	1:3
US	650,000	9.5	26	35.5	1:2.5
UV	650,000	9	25	34	1:2.7
UC	500,000	5	9	14	1:1.8
SFU	394,811	10	30	40	1:3
USR	367,386	6	22	28	1:3.7

GENERAL

The libraries readily form three groups according to the extent of their collections (Table 3-1). UBC and UA belong to the biggest group; US, UV and UC form the middle group, while SFU and USR are the smallest. What Rogers and Weber[1] regard as a "typical [university] cataloging staff" approximates a 1:1 professional to nonprofessional ratio if the chief cataloguer, his assistant, and the administrative officer are excluded - all of whom should in a large institution be occupied in administration.

---

[1] Rutherford D. Rogers and David C. Weber, University Library Administration. (New York: H. W. Wilson, 1971), p. 173.

Modification to LC cataloguing.

Each of the libraries adheres to Library of Congress cataloguing practice. This means that each adopts the Anglo-American Cataloging Rules, 1967 (North American text),[2] with superimposition for its main entry and descriptive cataloguing; the Library of Congress classification schedules[3] for its classification; and the Library of Congress List of Subject Headings[4] for its subject cataloguing.

Although they generally follow the above rules, each library has its own local modifications, resulting in each keeping a record of local decisions in a 'Cataloguing Manual.' Neither USR nor UC has any such manual. Instead, USR has an arrangement by which the cataloguers have to refer cataloguing problems to two experienced cataloguers versed in such modifications. At UC exceptions to rules are issued in the form of memos which the cataloguers can retain or use to update their copies of the schemes. An instruction sheet is also issued at the time a new cataloguer is being trained at UC.

---

[2] Anglo-American Cataloging Rules, prepared by the American Library Association, the Library of Congress, the Library Association and the Canadian Library Association. North American Text. (Chicago: American Library Association, 1967).

[3] U.S. Library of Congress. Processing Department. Subject Cataloging Division. Classification. (Washington, D.C.: Library of Congress [various dates]). 24 v. and Supps.

[4] U.S. Library of Congress. Subject Cataloging Division. Processing Department. The Subject Headings Used in the Dictionary Catalogs of the Library of Congress. 7th ed. Edited by Marguerite V. Quattelbaum. (Washington, D.C.: Library of Congress, 1966).

TABLE 3-2

MAJOR AREAS OF MODIFICATION TO THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS CLASSIFICATION SCHEDULES

Libraries	Canadian History	Canadian Literature	Law	Curriculum Laboratory Collection	Subject Bibliography
UA	F5000-5999	PS8000 (English) PS9000 (French)	KF for Canada, U.S. & Commonwealth. Local system for others.	Juvenile fiction in PZ. Others in the normal schedule.	Classified according to subject, followed by cutter of Z.
UBC	F5000-6099	PR8900-9399	Moys' Scheme: K - KV	PZ 4.9-90	Classified according to subject with Z preceding.
UC	F5000-5999	PS8000 (English) PS9000 (French)	Los Angeles County Scheme	No modification	Classified according to subject with Z preceding.
USR	F5000-5999	PS8001-8599 PS9001-9599 (French)	Uses LC 'K' as it is	No modification	Z5001-8000. Science & Tech: Q-V.
US	F1000-1199	PR9100-9999	Uses a shelf-mark (not a classification scheme)	Dewey	Z5051-7999
SFU	F5000-6099	PR8900-9999	Canadian law with subjects. Library of Parliament law schedule (K)	No modification but designated curriculum collection.	Classified according to subject but distinguished by Z9 cutter.
UV	F1000-1170	PS8000-8576	Library of Parliament K, KA, KB, KL. Also H and J according to subject	Dewey 9th & 18th. LC number included on each card	Classified according to subject

CLASSIFICATION

Two kinds of modification are presented in Table 3-2: a modification of a Library of Congress classification and replacement of a Library of Congress schedule with one from another scheme. UA maintains the Library of Congress classification pattern even in those areas where it finds it necessary to change the existing provision. Thus, it relocates F1000-1140 materials (Canadian history and description) in F5000-5999.[5] UBC relocates E351-364.9 materials in F5073; F901-951 in F5901-5951; and F1001-1199 in F5000-6099[6] (all embracing Canadian history and Alaska). The decision, in the 1940's, of Dr. W. Kaye Lamb to undertake the provision of F5000-6099 was made when UBC received the Howay-Reid Canadiana collection, augmenting its existing collection of Canadian history materials by at least 15,000 items. The additional numbers available by use of F5000-6099 instead of F5000-5999 allow for more detailed expansion; Alaska was included in this revision because of its geographical and historical proximity to British Columbia and the Yukon. In Dr. Lamb's words:

> So many books about the one related also to the other that the convenience of this arrangement far outweighs the impropriety of divorcing Alaska from the United States.[7]

One major difference between this and the modification by Peel was the provision of separate numbers for regions. A third provision[8] was undertaken in 1960 by the Public Archives in collaboration with the Cataloguing Division of the National Library of Canada. One of the major differences between this and the two previous provisions is the period division, 1914-1945, instead of 1914-1939. This schedule, in turn, has been adopted by a number of libraries and is presently the most widely used version among Canadian libraries.

---

[5] Bruce B. Peel, Canadian History Classification. Based on an adaptation of the Library of Congress classification as proposed by Dr. W. Kaye Lamb. Developed at the University of Alberta, Edmonton, 1952.

[6] W. Kaye Lamb, "A Library Classification for Canadian History," Canadian Historical Review, XXVII (September, 1946), pp. 275-82.

[7] Ibid., p. 282.

In 1969 the Bibliothèque nationale du Québec, in collaboration with a number of other libraries in Quebec, developed a completely revised F5000 schedule for the classification of Canadian history.[9] The assignment of numbers to topics bears no relationship to that in the other versions of F5000. A further departure from the other three schedules is the subdivision of historical periods by administration, similar to the arrangement followed by the Library of Congress in its history classification schedules. This schedule has so far been adopted by the Bibliothèque nationale du Québec, Université du Québec and Université de Sherbrooke. Thus, of the four different versions of F5000 now in use, none is totally accepted as the standard for the classification of Canadian history. UC and USR also adopt the F5000-5999 version for Canadian history whilst US continues to use F1000-1199, although it plans to change now that the recommendation for

---

[8] Public Archives of Canada. Classification Schedule: Canada, F5000-F5999. Prepared by the Library of the Public Archives of Canada, with the collaboration of the Cataloguing Division of the National Library of Canada, Ottawa, 1960.

[9] Bibliotheque nationale du Quebec. Histoire du Canada: table de classification F5000. (Québec; Ministère des Affaires culturelles, 1969).

Canadian history of the National Task Force on Cataloguing Standards[10] has been accepted by the National Library. Instead of F1000-1140, SFU uses F5000-6099 for Canadian history. UV, on the other hand, uses F1000-1170 for the same purpose.

The classification of Canadian literature in these libraries also varies (Table 3-2). The sole schedule expanding Library of Congress numbers for Canadian literature has remained substantially unchanged since its development in 1952. This PS8000 expansion[11] was originally devised by T. R. McCloy for use in the library of the Public Archives of Canada. With some modifications, the scheme is now used by the library of the Public Archives and the National Library of Canada. Libraries such as UA and UC, which are not happy with the options provided in McCloy's schedule, generally adopt PS9000 for French Canadian literature. Some use odd-and-even-number approach to separate English from French language material while others classify both English and French language material together. The remainder classify by standard Library of Congress but with a locally developed scheme or a mixture of systems. UA classifies folklore including folktales (GR) in a literature number. UBC classifies both the English and the French versions of Canadian literature (PR and PS) in PR8900-9399 and uses PR10 and PR11 - PR11.7 for its Colbeck Collection.

---

[10] Canadian Task Group on Cataloguing Standards. Cataloguing standards: the report of the . . . Group . . . with recommendations to the National Librarian, Dr. Guy Sylvestre. (Ottawa: National Library of Canada, 1972), pp. 22-25.

[11] T. R. McCloy, "A Classification Schedule for Canadian Literature," Ontario Library Review, XXXVI (May, 1952), pp. 91-92. This article gives a brief outline and explanation of the schedule.

Norman Colbeck's personal collection of some 50,000 volumes of 19th century English literature was given to UBC in 1967, and is being kept there as a separate collection. At UV, special collections are also, as a rule, kept together; for example, this library has the world's largest collection on the Abbey Theatre in Dublin. Individuals connected with the theatre, irrespective of where the Library of Congress has classed them, are included here. Although the classifications used for these special collections are still basically the Library of Congress, their schedules are expanded to accommodate the special material. USR adopts, for Canadian literature, PS8001-8599 (English) and PS9001-9599 (French), while US keeps all its Canadian literature in PR (PR9100-9999). The same is true of SFU except that its literature number differs from that of US (SFU's starts at PR8900). At SFU, Commonwealth literature provision for individual authors (including those writing in English) is PR9399.01 - PR9898 with the general literature in PR1800-6076, while UV uses PS8000-8576 for Canadian literature.

UA uses Library of Congress KF (Commonwealth law) for Canadian law, UBC uses Moys,[12] while UC adopts the Los Angeles County scheme for law.[13] USR does not have any modification for law and so uses the Library of Congress K schedule as it is. The bulk of the law collection at US is organized by a shelf mark which is not a classification scheme at all. This shelf mark arrangement has been highly unsatisfactory so that one major project of the library is to reclassify its law collections. At SFU, the law of a particular subject is classified with the specific subject. The subject of law itself and the laws of individual countries are classed in KX-KXY, except United States' law which is classed in KF. UV adopts the [Canadian] Library of Parliament version of the Library of Congress schedule for law,[14] and also classifies legal materials in the H and J schedules of the Library of Congress according to the subject treated.

---

[12] Elizabeth M. Moys, A Classification Scheme for Law Books. (London: Butterworth, 1968).

[13] U.S. Los Angeles County Law Library. Classification Schedule: Class K, Law. 4th ed. (Los Angeles, 1965).

For bibliography, UA uses numbers up to and including general bibliography (Z 1121). National bibliography numbers are used for national bibliography in the strictest sense of the term - that is, books on all subjects published in a particular country. For bibliographies covering a country as a subject, it uses classes D-F. Z1202-9000 are reclassified by subject so that a subject bibliography shelves with the books on the subject. UBC classifies subject bibliographies (Z881-980) in Z1201-7999 plus subject class. It also uses a modified PZ 4.9 to 90 for Juvenile Literature, a revision of the Library of Congress schedule (available in manuscript form only) provided in 1962 by Sheila Egoff and G. Turner for teaching purposes, to separate certain categories (for example, myths) which were lumped together by the Library of Congress. UC also devised its own scheme for subject bibliography, using (as UBC does) Z before normal class numbers; for example, 'A bibliography of swimming and diving' is classified in ZGV 837. At SFU, subject and personal bibliographies are classified with the subject. Bibliographies not limited to a specific subject, or that do not deal with a geographical or political entity, would remain in the Z collection.

---

[14] Canada. Library of Parliament. Classification: Law, Class K. (Ottawa, 1969).

UA does not use CT for individual biographies unless the subject of the biography is considered insignificant; this means that it classes individual biographies differently from LC. At SFU, the CT schedule is used for general works only; that is, for collections and individual biography, not regarded as illustrative of any one specific class or subject represented in the schedules of other classes. National biographies are classed in D-F; for example, 'Who's who in Canada' in F5009W48.

Both UBC and UC have adopted the [United States] National Library of Medicine scheme[15] for their medical collections. USR uses the Dewey Decimal Classification scheme[16] for its school library collection. The same is true of US. UV's school library collection had been, earlier on, classified according to a home-made version of Dewey but has been recently recatalogued according to the 18th edition of Dewey. Its juvenile literature, on the other hand, is classified in the special place in the Library of Congress PZ schedule.

---

[15] U.S. National Library of Medicine. Classification; a scheme for the shelf arrangement of books in the field of medicine and its related sciences. 3rd ed. (Bethesda, Md., 1964).

[16] Melvil Dewey, Dewey Decimal Classification and Relativ Index. Edition 18. (Lake Placid Club, New York: Forest Press of Lake Placid Club Education Foundation, 1971).

The Call Number.

A classification number indicates the subject treated by a particular work and is, accordingly, taken from the classification scheme in use in the particular library. The book number is a shorthand contrivance, or symbol, which expresses in compact form the author's name and, when desirable, the title and edition of a book. The numbers themselves are obtained from tables prepared for the purpose, the best known being the Cutter-Sanborn Table[17] and the

TABLE 3-3

CHANGES IN CALL NUMBERS

Libraries	Total no. of entries located	Exact copies of LC classification number	Percentage agreement in classification number	Exact copies of LC book number	Percentage agreement in book number	Exact copies of LC call no.	Percentage agreement in call no.
UA	166	148	89.16	21	12.65	3	1.8
UBC	164	143	87.2	152	92.7	27	29
UC	149	120	80.54	12	8.05	12	8.1
USR	113	107	94.67	108	95.58	107	94.1
US	101	98	97	4	3.96	4	3.9
SFU	145	134	92.4	125	86.21	125	86.2
UV	160	149	93.13	136	85	125	78.1
TOTAL	998	899	90.6%	558	54.8%	403	43%

---

[17] Cutter, Charles Ami. Cutter-Sanborn three-figure author table: Swanson-Swift Revision. (Chicopee, Mass.: Huntting, 1969).

Library of Congress Author Number Table.[18] The call number consists of the classification number and the book number.

UA.

Although Table 3-3 indicates that a total of 148 UA classification numbers are exact copies of LC, in 145 of those 148 entries, UA and LC call numbers differ. This is brought about by the fact that UA uses a different book number (Cutter-Sanborn) instead of the Library of Congress Author Number Table.

UBC.

Of the 21 classifications here that are not exact copies of LC, 11 are in those areas where UBC uses schemes other than the Library of Congress - NLM for medicine (6), Moys' scheme for law (1), and Canadiana for Canadian history (4). Unlike UA, UBC does use Library of Congress book numbers. Even at that, of the 143 entries in which UBC classification is the exact copy of LC, the call number is the same in only 27 cases, because as a rule this library includes the date of publication as part of the call number, whether it is the first or a subsequent edition.

UC.

Out of the 120 classification numbers that are exact copies of LC only 12 have the same call number. In the remaining 108 entries,

---

[18] U.S. Library of Congress. Processing Department. Cataloging Service Bulletin No. 104, (May,1972), pp. 7-8.

UC has used a different book number.

USR.

USR uses LC copy - as does UBC - down to the book number. Only six of the 113 titles are differently classified and in two of them it is a matter only of a slight deviation.

US.

US is even closer in classification to LC copy than USR. Despite this, US book numbers agree with LC copy in only 4 out of 101 entries, because of its policy to use the Cutter-Sanborn table.

SFU.

Only 11 of the 145 entries differ from LC classification. In terms of the use of the book number, the percentage drops slightly, even with SFU using the Library of Congress Author Number Table, since in 9 more entries, SFU book numbers differ from LC, making a total of 20 differences.

UV.

Only 11 of the 160 entries found differ in their classification from LC copy. Out of these, 4 are cases of minor differences and one of them is a typographical error.

Apart from the classification, there are 24 other cases of the use of a different book number by UV, thus widening the difference between it and LC copy. With this library's fairly high rate of original cataloguing, to be discussed later, these differences would be expected.

Only one LC catalogue card was identified out of the 160 entries checked, and this had been filed unedited.

DESCRIPTIVE CATALOGUING

The basic catalogue in each library is the author/title catalogue. All cataloguing information is put on 3" x 5" cards with the description and entry based on the Anglo-American Cataloging Rules (1967) - North American Text.

This 'new code' is in turn based on the outcome of the 1961 International Conference on Cataloguing Principles (Paris)[19] which was influenced by Lubetzky's Code of Cataloging Rules.[20] The Anglo-American Cataloging Rules is therefore international, not only because it is the joint production of cataloguers from Germany, Central Europe, Great Britain and the North American continent, but also because it is largely consistent with an internationally accepted set of principles for author and title entry. Because of pressure from the Library of Congress and the Association of Research Libraries in the United States faced with large-scale alterations of entries in their catalogues if the 'Paris Principles' were accepted in their entirety, the North American Text contains some possible deviations. It is this text which the Library of Congress follows so that the practices of the seven libraries in this study should also be based on the same text.

---

[19] International Federation of Library Associations. International Conference on Cataloguing Principles, Paris, 9th-18th October, 1961: Report; A. H. Chaplin, ed. (London, 1963).

[20] Seymour Lubetzky, Cataloging Rules and Principles: a critique of the ALA Rules for Entry and a Proposed Design for their Revision. (Washington, D.C.: Library of Congress, 1953).

Descriptive cataloguing refers to the description of the book or document which comprises the main part of the catalogue entry; that is, all the entry including the heading.

Standard Elements.

The description consists of two principal parts, each set out in a separate paragraph:

1. Details of the item being catalogued, as generally found on the title-page. These are given in the following order - title, subtitle (if any), author statement, edition, and imprint.
2. The cataloguer's description of the physical volume, phrased in standardized terminology. This appears in a separate paragraph, and comprises the following items: number of volumes/pages, plates, illustrative matter other than plates, size, and the name of the series to which the book belongs, if any. The importance of consistency of terminology and order cannot be too strongly emphasized. A catalogue will be much easier to use if each item described in it is catalogued systematically in a consistent order. The order is laid down for the cataloguer in the rules for descriptive cataloguing.

Extra Elements.

Apart from the above standard elements, the Library of Congress usually provides such extra data as book price, Dewey Decimal number, LC card number and standard book number (now international standard book number). Some of these are adopted by local libraries in their own catalogues.

The author or main entry, the title, the edition, the imprint and the collation are the standard, and all the others are the extra bibliographic elements.

Author or Main Entry.

The names of authors, whether personal or corporate, are repeated in the transcript of the title, in exactly the form in which they appear on the title-page. However, the repetition of the author's name may be omitted if the form used for the author in the heading does not materially differ from that given on the title-page or when it is permanently associated with a catalogue entry, whatever the type of entry, as would happen in unit card entry.

Title.

The title is usually transcribed as given on the title-page of the work being catalogued. This covers order, wording, spelling, accentuation and other diacritical marks, but not necessarily punctuation and capitalization.

Edition.

A statement of the edition of a work is included on every catalogue entry for every edition other than the first and is usually abbreviated. The names of editors, translators, illustrators, and so on, are included in the edition statement when the work might be identified by them.

Imprint.

The imprint refers to the statement of the place of publication, publisher and date, in that order, as normally found on the title page, but not necessarily stated there in that order. If the imprint (or part of it) is not included on the title-page of a work being catalogued, it may be supplied, in the language of the title, in square brackets.

Collation.

The collation is the part of the description which describes the physical features of the book being catalogued. It comprises three main elements:

1. The number of pages or volumes and the number of plates.
2. The principal types of illustration.
3. The size of the volume.

As the findings from this survey indicate, the descriptive cataloguing of the libraries, in general, is simpler than LC; a number of elements in LC copy are omitted by the libraries; notably the book price, Dewey Decimal number, details of illustrative matter, the author as a part of the title statement, and an indication of national or the first edition. It is hard to generalize about the handling of the SBN/ISBN and the LC card number from one library to another, or even within the same library, as subsequent figures will show. Their inclusion could be said to be more prevalent than their exclusion.

The card format of each library is basically that of the LC. There is considerable cutting down on the extent and number of notes, both content and bibliographic. One regular additon consists of the initials of the cataloguer and sometimes of the typist too (usually as one of the last items on the card) as well as the date on which cataloguing was completed. Also usually added are the book accession number and the NUC identification code for the library; the latter item is for use at the National Union Catalogue at Ottawa for inter-library cooperation.

Generally, the libraries do full cataloguing. There is one case of simplified cataloguing (Appendix 2) and another case of extensive use of full LC bibliographic description. What follows is an element-by-element description of the libraries' practices as compared to LC copy, meant to highlight the main areas of difference:

Main Entry.

TABLE 3-4

CHANGES IN MAIN ENTRIES

Libraries	No. of Entries Found	Number Different From LC Main Entry	% Difference
UA	166	1	.6
UBC	164	1	.6
UC	149	8	5.4
USR	113	1	.9
US	101	1	1.0
SFU	145	3	2.1
UV	160	3	1.9
TOTAL		18	1.8 per cent

Imprint.

UA - No change; follows LC practice.

UBC - No change; follows LC practice.

UC - Omits the place of publication as well as the publisher. Only the publication date appears on its entries (135 out of the 149 entries located). This is a result of the simplified cataloguing practised in this library up to August 1972 (See Appendix 2).

USR - The imprint is an exact copy of LC except that in 2 out of the 113 entries located here, the place of publication is omitted.

US - No change; follows LC practice.

SFU - No change; follows LC practice.

UV - No change; follows LC practice.

Collation.

TABLE 3-5

PRELIMINARY PAGES

Libraries	No. of entries found	LC copy with preliminary pages	No. in the library with preliminary pages	% Inclusion
UA	166	99	88	88.8
UBC	164	114	112	98.2
UC	149	100	0	0
USR	113	82	46	56.1
US	101	70	70	100.
SFU	145	98	39	39.8
UV	160	106	82	77.4

UA - Generally, the preliminary pages are indicated, but this policy does not appear to be consistently followed (See Appendix 2).

UBC - The preliminary pages are included in the collation of 112 out of 114 entries.

UC - No collation statement. In 18 entries out of 149 the number of pages alone is given.

USR - It is difficult to establish the existence of any clear-cut policy as to the treatment of preliminary pages in this library; out of the 113 entries located here, the LC copy has preliminary pages on 82; only 46 of these feature in USR copy, with the remaining 36 omitted. The same is true of book size which LC always carries. Out of the titles studied, USR indicates it in only 51 entries, omitting it in the remaining 62.

US - No change; follows LC practice.

SFU - Is inconsistent in the elimination of preliminary pages (39.8 per cent inclusion). It drops any mention of the size of the book.

UV - Includes preliminary pages most of the time, though not always (77.4 per cent inclusion). Does not, as a rule, include the size of the book. Out of the 160 entries studied here, not even one entry bears this element.

Notes.

UA - Out of 166 entries found, LC copy has notes in 132 of them, with UA adopting only 23.

UBC - No change; follows LC practice.

UC - No contents notes detected within the 149 entries studied; there are, however, 8 bibliographical notes out of the 116 which appear on LC copy within the 149 entries. The 8 entries are likely to have been catalogued after August 1972 when the library went back to full cataloguing.

USR - Omits bibliographical notes, whether they refer to actual bibliographies or to bibliographical references. There are a total of 66 cases of such exclusions from the checking. But there are also 8 cases where they are included.

US - No change; follows LC practice. Omits only 6 out of 88 notes discovered on LC copy.

SFU - Out of the 145 entries, LC carries this element on 90; SFU adopts 36 of them, excluding 54.

UV - Such notes are identified in 124 LC entries within the 160 studied, with UV adopting 118 of them, omitting only 6.

Series.

UA - No change; follows LC practice.

UBC - All the series indicated in LC copy are traced, whether traced by LC or not.

UC - The practice is to omit all series, although out of the 34 series entries indicated on the LC copy of the 149 titles studied, UC adopts 7. The explanation for these 7 might be similar to that given under 'Notes' above in respect of the 8 cases of bibliographical notes.

USR - No change; follows LC practice.

US - The practice is to make entry for all series. There is only one case of where LC makes a series entry but US does not.

SFU - Within the 145 title entries studied, SFU makes ten more entries than LC copy provides.

UV - No change; follows LC practice.

LC Card Number.

UA - This element appears on 160 LC copy out of the 166 entries studied here, with UA adopting 46, omitting the remaining 114.

UBC - There are almost an equal number of inclusions as there are exclusions of this element; practice is, therefore, inconsistent.

UC - This element is systematically excluded. Instead, it is the accession number that appears on every card.

USR - Includes this element much more consistently than any other extra element.

US - Generally includes this element although in 33 out of 101 entries located, it is dropped.

SFU - Out of 145 entries studied, 98 have LC numbers.

UV - Out of the 126 LC card numbers that appear in 160 LC copy, UV includes only 27.

SBN/ISBN.

UA - Excludes 35 of these but includes 22 others. The ratio makes it difficult to determine whether or not the library has a clear-cut policy with regards to this bibliographic element.

UBC - The cases of inclusion and exclusion are again almost balanced so that the existence of a clear-cut policy about these elements would again be hard to determine.

UC - The elements are systematically excluded, even in the few cards that have full cataloguing.

USR - The elements are generally included. Out of 113 title entries studied, LC copy has SBN/ISBN on 50 entries, with USR adopting 41, omitting 9.

US - This library generally includes these elements in its descriptive cataloguing. Within 101 title entries located here, LC copy has these elements on 42, with US adopting 28 and omitting 14.

Book Price.

UA - Totally excluded.

UBC - Within 164 entries studied, this element appears in 93 LC copy. Of these 79 are repeated on UBC entries.

UC - Totally excluded.

USR - Totally excluded.

US - This library generally includes this element on its catalogue cards for determining the replacement charge for those books that might be lost by the students. Such prices are identified in 64 LC copy within 101 entries studied here, with US omitting only 8 and adopting the remaining 56.

SFU - The 145 entries studied yield 74 book prices on LC copy, all of which are excluded by SFU.

UV - The 160 entries here yield 92 book prices on LC copy, only one of which is adopted by UV.

Concerning the remaining elements, the practice of the libraries is identical with that of the Library of Congress except in the following few cases: the libraries exclude the author (or editor) from the title statement, except when the inclusion would bring in new information, as in the case of joint authors or pseudonymous works. All the libraries drop the Dewey decimal number except the UBC cards, which are exact replicas of LC copy.

SUBJECT CATALOGUING

Each library is using the latest edition of the Library of Congress Subject Headings supplemented with the List of Canadian Subject Headings.[21] The latter list is used in an attempt to cope with the growing amount of Canadian published materials which require subject control, and is applied only in those cases where the Library of Congress list does not adequately provide for topics relating to Canada.

Both UBC and UC also use MeSH (Medical Subject Headings)[22] for medical books. UA also uses the Library of Congress Subject

---

[21] Canadian Library Association. Committee on Canadian Subject Headings. A List of Canadian Subject Headings, edited by the Committee. (Ottawa: Canadian Library Association, 1968).

[22] U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. National Library of Medicine. Medical Subject Headings. (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1972).

Headings for Children's Literature[23] for its Curriculum Laboratory material. Although UV uses the University of California cumulation of subject headings,[24] this is not a different list but a cumulation of ten annual cumulations of the Library of Congress list. Similar to the University of California cumulation, but not yet in use as a working tool, is a general index of the LC classification schedules being developed by the head cataloguers of UBC, UV and SFU under a Canadian Federal Government Local Initiatives Program grant[25] to provide their library users with a subject approach for general browsing in the stacks, and as a complement to the subject approach obtained through the LC subject heading list.

A subject heading is considered altered when something is either added to or deleted from the original heading on the LC copy. Such an alteration could be a subdivision of a heading, or merely the order of words, while the original heading is substantially retained. Dropping a heading is a total rejection of the heading assigned on LC copy, while providing an extra heading means that the extra heading is completely new - not an alteration of a heading already on LC copy.

---

[23] U.S. Library of Congress. Subject Cataloging Division. Processing Department. Subject Headings for Children's Literature: a statement of principles of application and a list of Headings, that vary from those used for Adult Literature. With Supplements. (Washington, D.C.: Library of Congress, 1969).

[24] U.S. Library of Congress. Subject Headings Supplements, 1966-1971 Cumulation. University of California Library Automation Program. Produced by the Supplement Cumulation Task Team. (Berkeley: University of California, June, 1972).

[25] University of British Columbia Library Bulletin, No. XCII February 15, 1973. (Vancouver, British Columbia).

TABLE 3-6

CHANGES IN ADDED ENTRIES

Libraries	No. of entries found	Subject Headings				Other Added Entries		
		No. of alterations	No. of extra headings provided	No. of LC subject headings dropped	% of total change in subject headings	Extra entries provided	LC entries dropped	% of total change in other added entries
UA	166	8	5	3	9.5	20	-	12.1
UBC	164	6	10	-	9.8	27	-	16.5
UC	149	15	19	7	27.5	8	9	11.4
USR	113	1	1	-	1.8	4	-	3.5
US	101	3	2	-	5	1	1	1.9
SFU	145	3	11	1	10.3	15	-	10.3
UV	160	6	12	1	11.9	12	4	10.0

The altered headings, the extra ones provided, and those dropped, are all regarded here as changes in subject headings (Table 3-6).

UA - Generally gives more specific headings than on LC copy.

UBC - MeSH is used in the Medical Branch Library but not in the main catalogue. The NUC book catalogues are also used as authorities for subject headings. Subject heading control, including the making of cross-references is done by the Catalog Maintenance Section. Cataloguers try to restrict the number of regular subject headings assigned to three, medical subject headings to five.

UC - UC makes the most extensive alterations of LC subject headings in terms of number, and also provides the greatest number of extra headings.

USR - is the closest to LC in subject cataloguing. Only one alteration was made to LC subject headings, according to the checklist study, and only one extra heading is provided; none was dropped.

US - is also very close to LC in subject cataloguing. There are three slight alterations: two are instances of a heading abbreviated in LC copy being rendered in full in the local copy. The third is a completion of an open entry for de Gaulle: US adds '1970' which indicates the end of the General's presidency of France. There are also two extra headings provided.

SFU - Subject cataloguing here is quite close to LC practice. There are only three cases in which SFU subject headings are altered from LC. There is one case in which SFU assigns just one subject heading instead of LC's two. The trend in SFU subject cataloguing, however, is to add to the number of headings given by LC. It provides 11 extra subject headings to 201 provided by LC within the 145 entries studied in this library.

UV - Apart from 6 cases of alteration in subject headings assigned, both UV's and LC's practices are quite similar. UV, however, assigns extra headings. Thus, the 160 entries studied here, yield a total of 12 extra subject headings assigned by UV. (Table 3-6). Extra subject headings are usually assigned in areas recognized to be specialities of UV: Pacific Rim, Linguistics, Canadiana and Marine Biology. Again, in Law, trials which are generally entered under the defendant are entered by UV under both defendant and author. In the same way, art works usually entered under the artist, are entered under both author and artist. This library also makes extra series entries and provides extra entries for items in its special collections. All biographies and autobiographies are given both subject and author entries at UV.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS: SPEED-UP TECHNIQUES IN CATALOGUING

TABLE 4-1

AVERAGE NUMBER OF TITLES CATALOGUED PER PERSON PER MONTH*

LIBRARY	PROFESSIONAL OUTPUT	NON-PROFESSIONAL OUTPUT
UA	140	340
UBC	200	600
UC	185	185
USR	125	225
US	96	200
SFU	250	850
UV	200	500

*Figures are approximations and in full-time equivalents.

Table 4-1 suggests the differences in the speed-up techniques employed by the libraries surveyed. A number of such techniques, as identified in the seven libraries, are presented in this chapter. They can be grouped together under four broad headings:

A. Pre-cataloguing Operations:

1. The merging of pre-order and pre-cataloguing searching,
2. The creation of one central file for all data received from cooperative sources,
3. The principle of dealing with exceptions,

4. Supply of preliminary cataloguing information to the cataloguer.

B. Copy-cataloguing operations - which make use of:

1. Shared Cataloguing (NPAC and Canadian) data,
2. Josten's catalogue cards,
3. MARC tapes,
4. Proofslips,
5. Micrographic Catalogue Retrieval Service,
6. Cataloging-in-Publication data.

C. Original cataloguing operations:

1. FASTCAT,
2. Making entries for all series.

D. Post-cataloguing operations - ticked tracing and yellow-highlighting for added entries.

The above groupings are not mutually exclusive. What has been labelled a pre-cataloguing technique could, for example, be the first step of copy-or even original cataloguing. For the same reason, a certain technique could be either a copy, or an original cataloguing operation depending on the availability or non-availability of the bibliographic information. Descriptions of such techniques will, however, be given under one group only. With the exception of the Canadian universities shared cataloguing programme, all other copy-cataloguing methods presented involve the use of LC copy in various forms.

What follows is a description of each technique with an indication of where it is used.

USE OF LC COPY IN CATALOGUING

TABLE 4-2

SOURCE OF CATALOGUE CARDS

SOURCE	LIBRARY						
	(Figures are estimate percentages. Total = 100%)						
	UA	UBC	UC	USR	US	SFU	UV
A. Purchased				40			
B. Prepared locally from forms of LC copy	60	60	50	30	65	80	50
C. Realized from copy other than LC	10	10					10
D. Realized from original cataloguing	30	30	50	30	35	20	40

The first seven cataloguing techniques to be presented in this chapter all hinge on the use of LC copy. While the extent of the use of LC copy varies from one library to another, as seen in Table 4-2, there is no library in which it does not contribute to at least fifty per cent of the catalogue cards produced. Compared with the trend among the academic libraries in the United States, as reported by

Ishimoto[1] and by Nixon and Bell,[2] the percentage yields are lower in Western Canada. Ishimoto's survey reveals that a reasonable ideal LC copy availability figure for large research libraries would be in the vicinity of seventy to seventy-five per cent, with a limited amount of deferred cataloguing, but she expected that this percentage would be higher for small and medium-sized research libraries. Nixon and Bell reported that a maximum of ninety per cent had been achieved by member libraries of the Association of Research Libraries (ARL). The average in Western Canada, based on this study and as borne out by Table 4-2, is only 62.1 per cent. Only SFU, followed by USR (the two smallest libraries in this survey) come close to the American figures. A greater volume of original cataloguing, therefore, is done in the Western Canadian universities in this study, with a resultant higher number of cataloguers so employed. This high staff strength in cataloguing is also reflected in the fact that, despite the high rate of original cataloguing in these libraries (Table 4-2), backlogs are mostly of manageable size and are even virtually non-existent in three of the libraries surveyed. UA has a 15,000-item backlog, UC 37,000, and US 3,000. UV has 750 items, which may easily dwindle to a few hundred of really in-process material, while USR and SFU report no backlogs. UBC has an official backlog of 3,000 items, although this does not include the 70,000 items in its Asian studies division.

---

[1] Ishimoto, "The National Program for Acquisitions and Cataloging," loc. cit., pp. 126-36.

[2] Roberta Nixon and Ray Bell, "The UCLA Library Catalog Supplement," Library Resources and Technical Services, XVII (Winter, 1973), pp. 28-31.

In the case of UC, 30,000 out of the reported 37,000 are 'Collections' material with low processing priority. These are materials secured from non-trade sources.

Provided there are no more staff cuts, it appears that the arrearage of any of the seven libraries is unlikely to increase for some time. All the librarians interviewed echo Elrod's recent report[3] of financial stringencies which appear to be taking effect already in these universities. One clear evidence of this situation is Stuart-Stubbs' open letter[4] to all members of his staff about the effect of UBC's financial difficulties on the library. It is possible that university budgets in Western Canada may be shrinking. Such programmes as Shared Cataloguing and Cataloging-in-Publication appear to be picking up impetus.

Forms of LC Copy.

Table 4-3 shows the forms of LC copy used by the seven libraries. The Library of Congress National Union Catalog is a basic source of LC catalogue copy in libraries following LC cataloguing practice. The other forms are described below:

Library of Congress Shared Cataloging Program.

There is a Library of Congress Shared Cataloging program, otherwise known as the 'National Program for Acquisitions and

---

[3] J. McRee Elrod, "Year's Work in Cataloging and Classification," Library Resources and Technical Services, XVII (Spring, 1973), p. 175.

[4] University of British Columbia Library Bulletin, XCIV (March 23, 1973), pp. 1-2.

TABLE 4-3

FORMS OF LC COPY IN USE

Library	NPAC Depository Cards	Josten's Cards	MARC Tapes	Proof-slips	MCRS Copy	CIP	NUC
UA					x	x	x
UBC	x						x
UC							x
USR		x	x			x	x
US			x				x
SFU				x		x	x
UV				x			x

Cataloging' (NPAC) by which the cataloguing already done by major United States and foreign libraries is used by the Library of Congress for the acquisition and cataloguing of overseas publications. Moore[5] has a detailed account of this operation while Lunn[6] has assessed its implications for the large North American university libraries with the blanket orders or approval plans for which it is basically designed.

The producer of each country's national bibliography supplies Library of Congress staff in each country with copy at the earliest possible moment. This is sent to the Library of Congress Shared Cataloging Division by airmail for its acquisition control files and for distribution. In addition, the large research libraries report back to the Library of Congress on all new titles in their libraries which are not found in the depository set of cards. Further airmail orders are then sent out, and when they come the books receive high priority cataloguing. The Library of Congress also tries to cover areas where there are no national bibliographies; for example, it has centres for this purpose at Nairobi, Djakarta and Rio de Janeiro. The consequences of the programme are: a great increase in the acquisition of material available to each research library; a drastic cut in the duplication of cataloguing effort; increased speed of receiving the cataloguing information in libraries; centralization and standardization of cataloguing; and wider availability of information about published material. Of the seven libraries in this study only UBC, however, receives the depository cards from the Library of Congress as a participant in this programme.

---

[5] Florence A. Moore, "Shared Cataloguing at LC," Technical Sidelights, III (November, 1969), pp. 2-6.

[6] Jean Lunn, "Shared cataloguing - the consumer in North America," Canadian Library Journal, XXVII (September-October, 1970), pp. 346-50.

These depository sets are more complete than the LC card service, proofslips or MARC tapes, in that the sets include the cross references and location data. Proofsheets are available for a price to any subscriber, but depository sets of cards are supplied only to selected research libraries in return for the commitment made by those libraries to report their acquisitions to Library of Congress.

The impact of the Library of Congress shared cataloging program at UBC is felt especially in the processing of its Japanese material.[7] UBC sends to the Library of Congress a record of titles which it is ordering but for which there are no cards. It is expected that the Library of Congress will then order the materials, catalogue them and supply the data. If the Library of Congress already has the title on order, but not yet catalogued, priority cataloguing follows. Such orders at UBC total between seventy and eighty items per month. The Library of Congress checks and returns the slips to UBC with all the pertinent information, and the printed cards follow. The report to the Library of Congress from the participating libraries is designed to help the former in putting titles of primary interest to the libraries in priority for cataloguing. If all participants were to submit such reports, it would act as a guideline to the Library of Congress, and in turn, they would get the cards sooner. Using multiple-copy order slips for this purpose would be little trouble for libraries. Once a report is made, LC cards are supposed to arrive shortly after, and so no original cataloguing is required for that title unless there is a rush request for it. Until a better method is found, this is one way of informing the Library of Congress of the titles which are given priority by the participating libraries. Making use of these LC cards has proved very successful in expediting the cataloguing of many East Asian libraries. The coverage of these cards has proved great and their use so convenient to Canadian participants that there has been little or no need for the few Canadian Asian collections to start a shared cataloguing programme of their own. The effectiveness of the entire NPAC can be judged by the fact that:

---

[7] Tung King Ng, "The impact of the Shared Cataloging Program on the processing of Japanese language material," (report on a survey presented at the annual conference of the committee on East Asian libraries, Association for Asian Studies, San Francisco, April 5, 1970).

> "The Library of Congress has increased its cataloging production 81% under the auspices of NPAC, from 11,000 new titles (in all languages) in fiscal 1965 to 200,373 titles in fiscal year 1969."[8]

Josten's Catalog cards.

Josten's cards are computer-printed from MARC data. They are issued by the Catalog Card Corporation of America, at Minneapolis, which claims to be the world's largest and most experienced supplier of computer-printed catalogue cards. They provide LC data arranged with many variations, according to the requirements of each customer. The cards are presently sold for 29¢ per set.

USR is the only library surveyed using Josten's cards (Table 4-2). In its experience, Josten's cards are not only quick in arrival; they also solve the problem of typing delays which have plagued the USR cataloguing department. Because most Josten's cards arrive with the books, this library feels that there is not much to choose, on basis of speed, between reliance on this service and getting the cataloguing information from MARC tapes (to which this library also has access) and then preparing their own cards. Josten's cards are filed unedited at USR with no loss of time.

Josten's files contain over 220,000 current titles - all the U.S. non-governmental publications available on MARC with LC card number prefixes. New additions to MARC are received every Friday and entered into the computer over the weekend, so that they are available to customers every Monday. RECON data (retrospective conversion to MARC) will be added as the Library of Congress makes it available to the company.

---

[8] U.S. Library of Congress. National Program for Acquisitions and Cataloging. Progress Report No. 9. (Washington, D.C., August 4, 1969). p. 3.

For rapid processing, printed labels are provided for book card, book pocket and spine. A wide variety in call numbers has been provided for. On his first order, a customer fills in his specifications on the computer cards the company supplies. If he wishes to change specifications on later orders, additional computer cards are supplied with each shipment.

A customer's order is usually entered the day it is received, and shipped back to him within three days, from a central United States location. All Josten needs is the LC card number. Cards are sent to the customer in his choice from four sequences - alphabetical by author (if he gives Josten the author's last name), alphabetical by title (if he gives the first word of the title), numerical, or same as ordered. The order will be shipped complete for all titles available on MARC the day it is entered. The customer will receive a dated author/card-number list of titles not yet on MARC which should be resubmitted with his next order in twenty-one days. Since Josten's adds between 1,500 and 3,000 new entries each week, this practice assures the customer of a comprehensive service.

MARC tapes.

MARC tapes are regularly used for cataloguing at US while USR uses them only intermittently to produce cataloguing copy. UA and UC are in the process of introducing MARC into their cataloguing with the latter modelled on TESA-1, which operates at US. UA does not intend to use MARC tapes until its automated system is operational.

US was one of the two Canadian and fourteen American MARC subscribers invited to a user's seminar at the Library of Congress in March, 1970, to discuss the strength and weaknesses of MARC, as well as to explore other possible uses for them.[9] A detailed description of MARC at US is provided by Kagis.[10] This has been updated by Burns and Pridmore,[11] in their 'second look' at TESA-1/Cataloguing, which reviews the new developments in the cataloguing sub-system between June, 1971 and June, 1972, as well as assessing the system's performance impact during the same period.

Automation at US encompases the ordering of library materials as the initial stage, through to cataloguing as the final stage. Claim notices, receiving reports, accounting statements and printed catalogue cards ready for filing, are some of the records produced by the computer. All possible pre-cataloguing information is captured at the initial ordering stage. All orders for English language monographs with a 1969 or later imprint are run against the MARC history tapes, either by LC number, SBN or author/title. The latter is made possible by the use of a compression code. If the title is on MARC, a 3" x 5" printout is produced. Entries for books with earlier imprints found in the National Union Catalog are photographed; entries not in NUC are searched in other catalogues; all relevant information is keypunched in machine-readable form, and purchase orders are generated by the computer. When the book has been received and the "order received" status card has been fed into the computer, the information derived from the above sources (MARC, photographs, or order input based on other sources) is recorded on computer-produced "edit sheets" for cataloguing use. Once the necessary editing is done by the cataloguers, the changes are entered into the machine-readable record (formerly by keypunching but now by an on-line terminal) and a revised edit sheet is produced. After final checking and any further changes, a "cataloguing edit complete" status card is fed into the computer, giving the signal that card sets may be produced. The card sets are then complete and ready for filing.

---

[9] G. C. Burgis, "A MARC user's seminar," Canadian Library Journal, XXVII (May-June, 1970), pp. 227-29.

[10] Y. Kagis, "Technical Services in Saskatchewan," Technical Sidelights, II (May, 1971), pp. 29-32.

[11] Barrie A. F. Burns and Peter Pridmore, "TESA-1/Cataloguing: a second look," in Library Automation in the Nation; papers presented at the CACUL Workshop on library automation. (University of Saskatchewan, Regina Campus, June 10-12, 1972).

A communications link - a dedicated telephone line - between US and USR enables the latter to submit LC card numbers, SBN, author/title or series statement to request MARC data for books awaiting cataloguing. Printouts for the corresponding items on MARC tapes are printed at USR Computer Centre.

Complete bibliographic information for recent English monographs acquired by the Library of Congress are received by US each week. They help to speed up the routines in the acquisition and cataloguing of library material and at the same time make possible advances towards a machine-readable catalogue for the library. The impact of TESA-1 on Cataloguing at US has been described by Burns.[12]

---

[12] Barrie A. F. Burns, "Technical Services in Saskatchewan," Technical Sidelights, III (May, 1972), pp. 25-30.

TABLE 4-4

MARC USE COMPARED WITH OTHER FORMS OF CATALOGUING AT US (1972)

Form	Number of cards	Approximate percentage
MARC	12,220	36.2
LC printed copy	7,822	23.2
New editions	4,562	13.5
Original cataloguing	9,133	27.1

Note: These are one month's figures.

From June 1971 through January 1972, 32.2 per cent of all items newly catalogued, made use of MARC data. Total use of LC copy in all forms for new items during the same period was 61.7 per cent. Lengthy delays awaiting multilith production of catalogue cards have been eliminated. An average of only five working days now elapse between the time cataloguing of an item begins and when the computer-produced cards are filed in the Main Library union catalogue.

By December, 1971, eighty-five per cent of all card production for US was computer-based. Monthly production figures have been just under 30,000 since that time, and daily outputs of between 2,500 and 3,000 cards are not uncommon. The highest daily total so far has been 4,802. The ALA-approved library print train, equipped with a full array of diacritics, has been in use since October, 1971. Main Library union catalogue cards now come from the computer "file ready," that is, sorted alphabetically by the first ten characters of each main or added entry, selected initial articles being disregarded by the sort program. Manual rough sorting of cards is no longer required since shelflist and location file cards come sorted by call number, National Library report cards by main entry, and branch library sets batched ready for sending to appropriate locations. The system is capable of accepting a variety of requirements for card set composition for branch libraries, and currently services some twenty different libraries or collections on US campus.

On-line entry of cataloguing data via an IBM 2741 typewriter terminal, inaugurated in December 1971, offers a number of advantages over the 029 keypunch, including simpler record format, easier verification and error correction plus the availability of a shift key for encoding upper case characters. Once catalogue cards have been produced for a title, the machine-readable record for that item is transferred to the library holdings file. Records in that file (which totalled some 24,500 by early March, 1972) may be updated and further sets of cards produced for copies of titles added to various branches at a later date or for transfers of items from one location to another. A further by-product of the library holdings file is a monthly series of lists of 'Recent Acquisitions' for both the main library of US and its branches.

Speed-up is also provided by TESA-1 and its batch system. This fully-automated processing system is designed for speedy cataloguing. It uses MARC data whenever available but does not delay items to await LC data unless MARC data is expected in the near future. A study of processing activity in the cataloguing department of US over the period, September, 1968 to August, 1969, conducted by

Buchinski,[13] produced figures which provide interesting comparisons with current processing. The study found that only 18 per cent of all books processed during that period were cleared through cataloguing within one month of accessioning, a further 14.9 per cent completed processing within one to two months, and 19.5 per cent within two to three months, giving a total of only 52.4 per cent processed within three months of accessioning. At the time of the Buchinski study, a sizeable backlog of some 8,000 items[14] had accumulated and card production was being changed over from LC printed cards to multilith. In April, 1972, a computer time interval study of status change activity in the TESA-1 'In Process File' covering 2,298 items (or 88 per cent of the total items reported processed that month) was conducted by means of a new statistical programme. The average time required for these items to attain "Processing Complete" status through cataloguing was eight calendar days. The study also showed that items remained at "Order Received" status in the 'In Process File' for an average of only five calendar days. Processing in this library now keeps pace with receipts.

Once the cataloguing process has been started, the cataloguers must finish each item they have begun. Until an item is completely processed, a listing for it appears each day. The impact of the system on the clerical staff of Cataloguing Department has been considerable. Typing has been almost eliminated - the only material that TESA-1 cannot handle is that requiring non-Roman alphabets. All cards, including added entry cards, arrive from the computer finished and ready for filing. The built-in card distribution routine removes the chore of remembering which cards go to which location. Although the cards are only rough-sorted, in fact it has proved possible to take them as they come and file them forthwith into the catalogue. A change in routine has cut the amount of keypunching considerably. Keypunching, which up to May, 1972 could be a week in arrears, became up to date by the next month. The use of a batch mode system means that there is a deadline to be met each day. The staff cannot work at their own pace as they might on an on-line system. Perhaps, the most significant feature of TESA-1 has been the greater control that it gives the cataloguing staff over any material being catalogued. From the moment a book is received in Acquisitions, they can locate it at any point in the process. Further, any errors or omissions made by either cataloguer or clerical are much more apparent. The passage of books through the department, and even more, the job of getting the cards into the catalogue, have been greatly expedited.

---

[13] Barrie A. F. Burns and Peter Pridmore, TESA-1/Cataloguing: a second look, 1972, p. 30.

[14] This figure has now dropped to 3,000.

Proofslips.

LC proofslips, the source of MARC data, are used for cataloguing at SFU and UV. Like MARC, they are delivered to subscribing libraries by mail, on a weekly basis.

The distribution of LC proofslips, like the distribution of MARC tapes, is now a service of the United States National Program for Acquisitions and Cataloging (NPAC). Waters and Costabile[15] have outlined the many uses to which these proofslips may be put in medium-sized academic libraries. They may be used as aids in bibliographic verification, in the book and card ordering processes, in card production and in selection. Economic and efficiency considerations seem to warrant their increased use. Brock[16] has clearly described the process in his account of its use at the North Carolina University Libraries.

Two articles[17] on verification searching agree on the wisdom of searching a proofslip file to locate information on current imprints before searching the printed NUC. The file is more up to date than the printed catalogues, although the catalogues include NUC entries, plus some cross-references, which make them more comprehensive than the file. In addition to using the cumulated file of proofslips as an aid in ordering current imprints, SFU and UV (and until recently UC, too) use it as an aid in cataloguing. If the file is searched so that LC cards may be ordered by card number, there will be savings on card costs, since the first card in a set costs five cents less when ordered by number than when ordered by author or title.[18] But neither of the two libraries in this study orders cards (Table 4-2). Moreover, it would be uneconomic to use such a file only to obtain LC card numbers, since the cost of file maintenance and searching would more than offset the lessened cost of the cards. SFU and UV after locating the proofslips in a cumulated file, use them to reproduce their own catalogue cards, rather than order them. Anderson[19] has shown that such reproduction of catalogue cards from proofslips can defray the entire cost of the Xerox 914 machine.

---

[15] Samuel T. Waters and Salvatore L. Costabile, "The proof of the pudding: using LC proofslips," College and Research Libraries, XXVIII (March, 1967), pp. 87-91.

[16] Clifton Brock, "Development at North Carolina," in Norman D. Stevens, ed., "The National Program for Acquisitions and Cataloging: a progress report on developments under Title II-C of the Higher Education Act of 1965," Library Resources and Technical Services, XII (Winter, 1968), pp. 25-27.

[17] Gerald J. Lazorick and Thomas L. Minder, "A least cost searching sequence," College and Research Libraries, XXV (March, 1964), pp. 126-128; and Ashby J. Fristoe, "The bitter end," Library Resources and Technical Services, X (Winter, 1966), pp. 91-95.

The main advantage of this form of LC copy in cataloguing lies in the speedy arrival of the proofslips in libraries which are not subscribing to MARC tapes. Payne and McGee[20] have shown by their study, that during the latter weeks of their test period the highest number of proofslip matches was with tape records received the same week or earlier. The North Carolina experience cited above reveals that the search of proofslips could yield 70 per cent (42 plus 28) of the total items searched for.

---

[18] U.S. Library of Congress. Processing Department. Cataloging Service Bulletin No. 73, (Washington, D.C., 1965), p. 1.

[19] James A. Anderson, "Break-even point for a proofslip operation," College and Research Libraries, XXXIII (March, 1972), pp. 119-21.

[20] Charles T. Payne and Robert S. McGee, "Comparisons of LC proofslips and MARC tape arrival dates at the University of Chicago Library," Journal of Library Automation, III (June, 1970), pp. 115-21.

Micrographic Catalog Retrieval Service.

The weekly service of the MCRS in microfiche from Information Dynamics Corporation, Reading (Massachusetts), is used at UA. The service provides all Library of Congress catalog entries on 5" x 8" negative microfiche. UA maintains a complete catalogue file, accessed by main entry and LC catalog card number, and, from 1970 forward, by title.

The service provides UA with all new LC catalog entries on a weekly basis. LC catalog card number indexes, and from 1970 forward, main entry indexes on microfiche, were provided in the basic subscription.

The MCRS data base consists of three major parts:

1. 'Current Additions', which are microfiche copies of LC National Program for Acquisitions and Cataloging depository cards,
2. CIP, which are entries from the LC Cataloging-in-Publication program extracted from MARC tapes, and
3. NUC, which are microfiche replications of the National Union Catalog, housed at the Library of Congress.

The 'Current Additions' data cover entries from 1970 and since 1970; the CIP data 1972 and since; the NUC data is the source of all data prior to 1970. 'Current Additions' provides LC catalogue entries for English and Foreign language titles, cross references, audiovisual and music titles. The 'NUC' portion of the file contains, in addition to all the LC catalogue entries, the contributed catalogue entries from major libraries as well.

The MCRS data base may be searched in three ways: by main entry index to 'Current Additions' (years subsequent to 1969, provided on 5" x 8" negative microfiche), by LC card number (all years, provided in hard-copy form, for 1963 forward, and 5" x 8" negative microfiche, 1953-1962); and by manual searching by main entry directly on the NUC microfiche.

The 'Current Additions' data file for each of the years subsequent to 1969 is broken into three parts: English, Audio Visual Materials and Foreign (plus cross references). For 1972, and the years following, the English portion has a section devoted to Cataloging-in-Publication (CIP) entries. The microfiche numbers for each class lie in the same range for each year: English, 001-499; CIP, 500-699; AVM; 700-899, Foreign, 900-1,500; each with a year prefix. Each portion of the file is updated on a weekly basis and it is this update that provides the speed-up effect. Additional microfiche are added in sequence to each of the file segments each week, except for the CIP, wherein each weekly addition is incorporated directly on the fiche containing the preceding week's data until a fiche is filled completely. Each week's CIP addition is dated, and most importantly, organized by LC call number. The NUC portion of the data base is added on a monthly, quarterly and annual basis, following the publication pattern of the National Union Catalog.

The update patterns of the LC Card Number Index and the Main Entry Index which are standard components of the MCRS, and the optional Titles Index, are identical. All indices appear as a sequence of Year-to-Date cumulations, within any current year, published monthly

(January through June), or bi-monthly (August, October and December). These are paralleled by cumulative supplements published weekly within each one-or-two-month period. Successive annuals are also comulated within a quinquennium. Provided the appropriate file entry is available, MCRS weekly service is as fast as the LC proof-slips or MARC tapes.

Cataloging In Publication.

CIP began in July, 1971, and its strategy is to catalogue titles at Library of Congress in advance of publication so that the bulk of the LC catalog card data is published as a part of the book (usually on the verso of the title page); thus, all such books are catalogued once and for all, at a central point, using standardized methods.

Four libraries - UA, USR, SFU and UV - use LC-CIP data for cataloguing information. What this means is, in effect, that all new books of these four libraries with CIP data are, immediately on arrival in their cataloguing departments, routed to a typist who types out unit cards from which added entries are generated, allowing the books to proceed to the shelves with minimum delay.

Collation and imprint are usually omitted from CIP cataloguing information. These had proved problem areas in the earlier Cataloging in Source experiment. Both are, however, easy to establish from the book in hand without involving a cataloguer.

QUICK CATALOGUING TECHNIQUES

This study recognizes two groups of speed-up methods in cataloguing:

1. the use of forms of LC copy, and
2. the use of those methods not derived from LC.

The receipt by libraries, of LC catalog copy in the form of printed NUC monthly, quarterly, annual or other cumulations is here considered a basic source of cataloguing information. The other forms of LC copy just described - proofslips, MARC tapes, MCRS microfiche, depository cards, CIP and Josten's cards - speed the books to their readers and avoid original cataloguing costs. These weekly services have become the standard sources of cataloguing copy in large Canadian university libraries.

What are considered in this study as 'Quick cataloguing' techniques follow from here till the end of this chapter, and involve, essentially, those speed-up methods not derived from LC data. They are:

a. The merging of pre-order and pre-cataloguing searching
b. Creation of one central file for cards received
c. The principle of dealing with exceptions
d. Supplying preliminary cataloguing information to the cataloguer
e. Canadian Universities Shared Cataloguing Programme
f. Ticked tracing and yellow highlighting of added entries
g. The policy of providing entry for all series

h. FASTCAT

i. Original cataloguing at UV.

A few of these quick cataloguing techniques could, however, use LC copy at one stage or the other, as was earlier explained in the introductory part of this chapter; such as FASTCAT and some of the preliminary cataloguing help given to the cataloguer. The Shared Cataloguing Programme among some Canadian Universities uses Canadiana and other copy, other than LC. Of the techniques listed above, only FASTCAT is a temporary cataloguing process, providing service until full cataloguing can be done.

What the libraries call rush cataloguing is not considered a speed-up method by this study as it does not really expedite cataloguing. Instead, the rush items receive full cataloguing. They are given top priority instead of being dealt with in normal sequence. This boils down to rushing the book but not the process. Perhaps, there is some marginal gain in speed consequent on the urgency surrounding such processing of rush items. What appears more certain is that such a procedure channels attention to materials that are in greater demand, thereby making cataloguing more responsive, albeit in the short run, to readers' priorities.

What follows is an itemized description of the quick cataloguing techniques.

Merging of Pre-Order and Pre-Cataloguing Searching.

The interviews revealed that bibliographic searching is a great consumer of library time and is often repeated in the journey of a single book through the acquisitions and cataloguing stages.

Even where the acquisitions information is passed over to cataloguing, as at UC, USR and UV, it is usually too general and therefore inadequate for the cataloguers.

At UC the verifiers in the acquisitions department, on finding an LC entry, will note the broad letters of the classification such as, 'PR', 'T' or 'Q' but not the complete class number. They also give the volume, page and column number of the book catalogue in which such information is located. If the NUC entry proves to be a copy contributed by a library other than LC, only the location in the catalogue (but not the class number) is given. A similar procedure is adopted at the USR except that here, acquisitions also supplies standing order and "useful copy" information - such information being an indication of a related work, a translation or another edition of the book under consideration. Neither UA nor SFU accept such information from their acquisitions departments, even when these departments have normally carried out a preliminary bibliographic search for the book in acquisitions. The merging of both pre-order and pre-cataloguing searching has been effected at UBC. Both procedures are carried out by the same unit in the cataloguing department. If copy is found during the pre-order search, no further search is required, as entry is established during such an initial hit. In this way, the inclusion of pre-order search in the catalogue department enables the initial search to be used to record any correct form of the main entry that may be established, as well as other information concerning the relation of the item to the collection - copy, edition, a continuation, etc. This identifies, at the earliest possible moment, those items which may simply be treated as added volumes or copies.

Creation of One Central File for Shared Cataloguing Cards.

This is another technique which cuts down on searching time by consolidating the number of sequences that might yield the desired bibliographic information. This technique is used at UBC which also receives LC depository cards under the National Program for Acquisitions and Cataloging (NPAC). Catalogue copy from various other sources (The National Library of Canada, all the cooperating universities in the Canadian Shared Cataloguing Programme, etc.) is filed in a single file, recommenced annually, and arranged in title sequence. Slips are filed in this depository control file representing books for which no copy is available, thus obviating repeated searches.

The Principle of Dealing with Exceptions.

A full description of this method as applied at UBC has been provided by Elrod.[21] The same technique is also used at SFU. Traditional cataloguing methods in major libraries have involved the consideration of each individual entry to be added to insure that the entry is consistent with forms already established. A sudden growth of acquisitions at UBC compelled its Cataloguing Department to develop this principle, which identifies and deals only with exceptions. The principle allows normal entries to be made with a minimum of in-process verification. The first innovation - no shelflist check - is accomplished by accepting the call number on the LC card, and adding to it the imprint date, to insure against exact duplication of numbers. Main entry verification catches cases where UBC's cutter number in literature differs from LC's. Items lacking an LC number receive a two-digit cutter number plus the imprint date, without any shelflist check. The second innovation - no subject authority file check - is accomplished by the use of ticked tracing. The idea behind the principle is that by considering entries as found on a title page or in LC, NUC or other Shared Cataloguing copy, as probably correct, and by establishing checks (such as guide cards) to identify those exceptions which are not correct, the library reduces drastically the number of individual cataloguing decisions which it must make. This method has the added advantage of creating cross references from discontinued subject headings, variant forms of series statements, and other forms of entry not used in the catalogue.

---

[21] J. McRee Elrod, "Applying the principle of dealing with exceptions," Library Resources and Technical Services, XVI (Summer, 1972), pp. 331-37.

Supply of Preliminary Cataloguing Information to the Cataloguer.

The discussion of merging pre-order and pre-cataloguing searching has dealt with some of the preliminary data available to a cataloguer. There are other types of such assistance. SFU maintains a distinct descriptive Cataloguing Unit which handles all descriptive cataloguing for all titles without LC copy before they are passed to the professional subject cataloguers. This descriptive cataloguing also includes series and name authority file checks. All subject headings, cross references and authority work are handled as a part of the subject catalogue maintenance procedure at the time the cards are filed into the catalogues. At UBC, the automated order system provides a five-part packet used as temporary catalogue cards and workslips. UBC also provides cataloguers with xeroxed title pages to use as worksheets.

The use of title-page photography in cataloguing has been reviewed comprehensively by Weimerskirch.[22] Its contribution to speed was spotlighted in 1951 by Raabe and Janiak,[23] who stated that while an experienced cataloguer, using traditional methods, could insert an average of forty titles a day into the card catalogue, the same cataloguer, using title-page photography, could insert an average of 200 titles into the catalogue per day. Perhaps, the first to describe the use of this procedure in practice was Polly-Bassitta[24] who, in a 1952 article, estimated that it would have taken ten years, working 48 hours a week, with no time off for vacation or any other reason, to catalogue the collection of 600,000 books in her library. After a tour of several Berlin libraries using the photographic system, she was convinced that it was the only method by which she could catalogue her collection in a reasonable length of time. Using methods that were essentially similar to those described by Raabe and Janiak, she found that she was able to catalogue five times as many books as she could have done in the traditional way. This figure corresponds exactly with the estimate given by Raabe and Janiak.

---

[22] Philip J. Weimerskirch, "The use of title-page photography in cataloging," Library Resources and Technical Services, XII (Winter, 1968), pp. 37-46.

[23] Hermann Raabe and Wilhelm Janiak, "Die Fotocopie im Dienste der Katalogisierung," Bild und Ton, IV (May, 1951), pp. 150-51.

[24] Lisabeth Polly-Bassitta, "Die Mikrophotographie im Dienste der Katalogisierung," Zentralblatt fur Bibliothekswesen, LXVI (November-December, 1952), pp. 418-23.

At UBC, the impact of title page photography has made a most dramatic change in original cataloguing.[25] To produce the worksheet in this library, a clear plastic overlay is placed on the xerox machine which has on the left side the categories of information to be supplied in addition to that on the title page. The title page is then xeroxed through the right half of the sheet (the verso of the fly leaf being on the left). This produces a worksheet on which title and imprint information need only be marked. (Formerly the entire worksheet was typed). Thus, title-page information need be typed or written by cataloguers only when there is an exception to using the information as found on the title page.

Canadian Universities Shared Cataloguing Programme.

Another Shared Cataloguing programme operates among eight[26] universities in Canada, by which they share among themselves the original cataloguing of new publications lacking LC copy, to speed up overall processing. A brief report of this cooperative arrangement was given in the 1971 "Year's Work in Cataloging and Classification,"[27] and a more detailed treatment has been provided by Elrod,[28] whilst Laskowski's account[29] is significant for its spotlight on the wastage rate of the programme (See Appendix 4 for statistics). The materials are divided among participants by title since the subject matter of some books does not readily reveal itself. To accommodate those universities that felt they could not contribute effectively if the allocation was by title alone there were additional allocations by area and language. Thus, UC was originally responsible for Spanish, German and Latin American material, whilst the University of Ottawa handles French language material. The other universities in the programme, except York University, divide the titles among themselves. York has the exclusive responsibility for Canadiana.

---

[25] Elrod, "Applying the principle of dealing with exceptions," loc. cit., p. 334.

[26] University of British Columbia Library Bulletin, Nos. XXXIX and LXVI (January 9, 1969, and July 6, 1971).

The participants were formerly ten in number. The programme started among the three British Columbia universities in this study, and later extended to others.

The procedure is that each participating library gives priority original cataloguing to any material in the area assigned to it as soon as such a material arrives. The slip or card bearing the finished cataloguing information is then sent at once to each of the participating libraries. This bibliographic information should be on its way in a day, or at the most two, of the receipt of the material in the library designated to generate the information.

---

[27] Suzanne Massonneau, "The year's work in cataloging and classification," Library Resources and Technical Services, XVI (Spring, 1972), p. 156.

[28] J. McRee Elrod, "A Canadian program of shared cataloguing," Canadian Library Journal, XXVIII (May, 1971), pp. 222-24.

[29] Seno Laskowski, "Technical services in Alberta," Technical Sidelights, III (May, 1972), pp. 31-32.

Four of the libraries in this study - UA, UBC, SFU and UV - make use of this arrangement to speed up their cataloguing. Because of the potentialities of the programme, UA, in 1971, abandoned its unsatisfactory local Law classification scheme, in favour of the Manitoba-York-Windsor adaptation of Library of Congress "KF" schedule for the Commonwealth countries.

US, USR, and more recently, UC, who are not in the programme, explain their reasons for non-participation: they do not use blanket order or on-approval acquisition plans, hence their incoming titles differ substantially from those in the larger libraries and the cooperative plan has little to offer them. US too, is well satisfied with MARC, and USR with Josten's service. This correlation between participation and blanket ordering explains the later withdrawal of Windsor University after joining the programme, as was reported by Baldwin:

> "Having no blanket or approval orders, Windsor did not relate well to the group."[30]

UC in due course withdrew primarily because its suspension of its proofslips subscription meant that there was no adequate means of verifying the material for which LC cataloging copy was available. It also lost its Spanish language cataloguer.

The Micrographic Catalog Retrieval Service (MCRS), has recently indicated an interest in this Shared Cataloguing Programme among Canadian universities. It has suggested that an arrangement might be worked out whereby the present programme participants send their catalogue copy to MCRS, instead of to each other (one slip to mail instead of eight). MCRS would then distribute all the contributed copy to the participants, sending microfiche to the MCRS subscribers, and paper copy to those who are not its subscribers. In addition, it would supply its MCRS title index free to each participant.

---

[30] Paul E. Baldwin, "Shared cataloguing programme: cost study; an interim report." (Unpublished, 1972).

Apart from these two significant shared cataloguing programmes, there are other sources from which these universities derive cataloguing copy, notably the Canadian National Library, which now provides copy for Canadiana. UV subscribes as well to the weekly issue of the Australian National Bibliography and the New Zealand National Bibliography.

Ticked Tracing or Yellow Highlighting of Added Entries.

In the current move to the computer-produced book catalogue, it should be remembered that it will still take some years before retrospective conversion will allow the creation of complete book catalogues for some of our major libraries. In the interim, any method which can make the card catalogue more flexible and more easily produced should not be overlooked. One such method is the indication of subject headings by ticked tracing or yellow highlighting.

Various divisions of the dictionary catalogue and various methods of guide-carding the subject portion of a divided catalogue to simplify use and reduce production effort have been suggested. Several of these have advocated the elimination of subject entries behind the individual subject guide cards, with the subject headings ticked for filing purposes against the tracing on the individual card. Such a technique has been introduced in the subject catalogues of UBC, SFU, UV, UA and UC, and has been described in some detail by Elrod.[31] UBC used ticks to indicate both subject and series entries but has, since 1972, changed to the use of yellow highlighting for the same purpose.[32]

The subject portion of the divided public catalogue has a guide card for each established subject heading. The guides are usually 1/2 cm higher than the standard catalogue cards. On each subject card, the subject is ticked in red at the bottom of the card and no typing is done.

A considerable saving in time can thus be made by dropping the typing of subject headings, especially as this eliminates any revision of the format of the standard LC entry or of a locally typed unit card.[33] The first step in the creation of such a subject catalogue is the division of the dictionary catalogue. Both the advantages and the problems of such a division have been too fully explored[34] to need listing here.

---

[31] J. McRee Elrod, "Applying the principle of dealing with exceptions," loc. cit., pp. 331-37.

[32] "Yellow highlighting on catalogue cards," University of British Columbia Library Bulletin, LXXXII (May 26, 1972).

[33] Henry Voos, "Revision of the current Library of Congress catalog card format," Library Resources and Technical Services, XI (Spring, 1967), pp. 167-72.

Although at the University of Missouri, a completely new file was begun when ticked tracing was begun, in the five universities here (in Western Canada) where it has been adopted, the switch was made by interfiling the new cards with the existing ones. The existence of some cards with subject and some without, in the same file, has created no real problems. Users seem to depend on the guide cards to locate the subject they need as soon as guide cards are inserted, whether headings are on the individual cards or not. No special instruction in their use has been needed. Users find the guide cards easier to use, each subject grouping being clearly shown.

Standard subdivisions are not normally shown in a library's subject authority file, but all such divisions must be typed on guide cards if they are used in the catalogue. It is not possible, therefore, to use the subject authority file as a source for typing the guide cards. They are best typed from the catalogue entries themselves, a guide being typed for each heading used. Of course, a subject with only one entry requires one guide card as well as another with hundreds, but it is no more work than to type it on the top of the added entry card, and once typed on the guide, it need never be typed again.

---

[34] J. McRee Elrod, "The divided catalog," Library Journal, LXXXVII (May 1, 1962), pp. 1728-30.

During the filing of the ticked cards, any ticked heading without a corresponding guide is returned to the cataloguing department, and a guide card and any required cross references are made. Changes in subject heading terminology are traced by references, for example: EDUCATION OF ADULTS _see_ ADULT EDUCATION. Such a reference could be typed across the top of a guide card of a different colour. If a filer finds an old card with EDUCATION OF ADULTS ticked in the tracing, he simply files it behind the guide ADULT EDUCATION, without making any change on the card or on the tracing.

Indeed, the subject authority file may be disposed of, and the guide cards themselves used as the authority file in conjunction with the most recent edition of the _Library of Congress List of Subject Headings_. Only those subject authority file cards which trace cross references need be retained and this tracing may be transferred to the verso of the guide cards.

Series entries, like subject headings, are no longer typed as headings on individual entries, but are also ticked in the tracing, and the entries filed behind guide cards. Series entries share with subject entries the characteristics of requiring a standard entry and cross references from variant forms.

The use of highlighting in making added entries is identical to the use of ticked tracing just described and has the same advantages. Instead of being ticked in red, the term is highlighted (that is, painted or brushed across with a yellow felt marker). Yellow was chosen for this purpose because the colour is conspicuous on a white card while the typing still remains quite legible beneath.

UBC moved over to yellow highlighting by the first half of 1972 because this makes the filing term more distinctive on the catalogue card than a mere tick, and so yellow highlighting makes for still faster filing and pulling operations than is achieved by ticked tracing.

UBC replaced ticking with yellow highlighting indicating both subject and series entries. Its discard slips also had their filing entries indicated in the same way. Series, title and main entries are highlighted where they appeared on the slip. Shelflist discard slips also have the call number highlighted.[35] By October, 1972[36] yellow highlighting of title cards for all its catalogues was being completed.

The ticked tracing or the yellow highlighted catalogue is a form of the subject card catalogue which is easier to create and affords better service than a traditional catalogue, in either dictionary or divided form. It may be established using existing cards with a minimum of expense. Assuming even the shortest delay possible in the arrival of the computer on-line or printout catalogue, considerable time still remains to be saved by using this technique.

---

[35] University of British Columbia Library Bulletin, No. LXXXII (May 26, 1972).

[36] University of British Columbia Library Bulletin, No. LXXXIX (October 3, 1972), p. 2.

The Policy of Providing Entry for All Series.

This technique is in use at UBC. New series, like new subject headings, are shown to be unestablished in the system if they lack a guide card (or a cross reference to a guide card) in the author/title catalogue. Like subject headings, series entries are not typed but instead are ticked (all series statements being traced).

Since no typing is involved, it is found to be less time-consuming to make entry for all series than to determine each time which to include and which to exclude.

FASTCAT.

The 'FASTCAT' of Scilken[37] and Gore[38] has already found adherents in two university libraries of Western Canada covered in this survey: UA and UBC. The Medical Library at UC is also using a temporary cataloguing technique similar to FASTCAT.

This technique is prompted by the aim of making new books available to the public while awaiting the receipt of LC cards or catalogue information. Although it was originally worked out for a library with only one professional cataloguer and one-and-a-half catalogue typists, many research libraries, especially in the United States, now optimize their utilization of NPAC/LC copy by this technique.

---

[37] Marvin H. Scilken, "Backlog to frontlog: a scheme for circulating nonfiction books without the help of LC," Library Journal, XCIV (September 15, 1969), pp. 3014-15.

[38] Daniel Gore, "In Hot pursuit of FASTCAT," Library Journal, XCVII (September 1, 1972), pp. 2693-95.

FASTCAT could be said to operate on the rationale that during the first weeks of a book's life, any listing which provides immediate access to the book is better than no access at all before full cataloguing is done; and that this access is worth it even if it should cost a little extra. This relates to Melcher's view that a book is most valuable when new:

> "...many a book could be said to lose value at the rate of 2 per cent a week. At least, there would probably be many a timely book which you would not order at all if you could not have it during its first year of availability. At the end of its first year, even a mint copy offered on a remainder counter at an 80-per cent discount might not seem attractive. That being the case, it cannot be an exaggeration to suggest that each week's delay in making the book available is like throwing away 2 per cent of what it cost to buy and process it."[39]

Where FASTCAT operates, a copy of the order slip is filed in the author/title catalogue by title, when the order is placed. When the book arrives, the Acquisitions Department retrieves this order slip from the file and types the order number on a call number label with the word, 'FASTCAT', on top of it. With this label, the book is immediately shelved in a special collection in the main reading room, prominently located where all will see it, and where all may borrow.

Once FASTCAT has been instituted, the nonprofessional cataloguer sees only the books with LC data cards while her professional counterpart handles only those for which there is little or no hope of receiving LC copy, thereby maximizing her professional time while allowing for an orderly work flow. Every book awaiting LC copy may be located easily. By this arrangement, the Cataloguing Department houses only those books which are actually in process. Readers have easy and immediate access to new books both for browsing and borrowing.

---

[39] Melcher, Melcher on acquisition, pp. 105-06.

FASTCAT is a particularly useful technique for libraries receiving books on an approval plan. Since those books tend to reach the library months earlier than they would if they were conventionally ordered, the effect is to exacerbate the problem of cataloguing backlogs. The sooner the book reaches the library, the longer it has to wait in the workroom for the cataloguing copy. With FASTCAT the book gets to the borrower much sooner than conventionally ordered books do.

Laskowski[40] has provided a description of this technique as employed at UA. It was introduced here following reductions in cataloguing staff, while the book acquisition rate remained relatively stable, and enabled UA to make immediately available for circulation those books for which LC copy had not been received. Entries for new books are first searched in LC. If copy is not found, items are assigned the two alphabetic letters of the LC classification number. Key punchers than transfer, from a book order slip, the library location, class numbers, accession number, and as much of the author/title as goes on an 80-column card. The books are then lettered and placed on the open shelves. On a weekly basis, a cumulative printout is prepared of all books on the FASTCAT shelves. The computer-produced printout, arranged in author sequence, provides the only bibliographic access to the fastcatalogued books. After 8-10 months, books are searched again in LC and fully catalogued.

---

[40] Seno Laskowski, "Technical services in Alberta," Technical Sidelights, IV (May, 1973), pp. 17-19.

FASTCAT is applied at UBC to the East Asian Division of the library. On the arrival of new books, they are given a broad classification number (in pencil) on the title page, and slips are filed in the location file. The length of the wait for full cataloguing depends on the language of the material. Urdu may be kept for thirteen months, Chinese three months, and South Asian fifteen months. These figures represent, however, maximum periods. Generally, a maturation period of six months suffices. Title and subject access to the material during the waiting period are provided. The title file is kept in the workroom but may be consulted by any reader on request. The subject approach corresponds to the order in which the books are shelved, using the rough classification number pencilled on the title pages. This was designed to facilitate browsing.

At the Medical Library of UC, a new publication is not catalogued until two weeks have elapsed. The material is initially given a temporary author/title catalogue entry and is kept on a display shelf for users, but it may not be borrowed until the expiration of the two weeks. The aim is to give every member of the faculty a chance to see the book before it goes out on loan. Meanwhile, browsers may indicate interest on an attached slip. The lending order of each particular book follows the order of names on the slip.

Original Cataloguing at Victoria.

The attitude observed at UV could be termed a "psychological speed-up" method of cataloguing: a determination always to bridge the gap between acquisitions and cataloguing, and not to accept a cataloguing backlog as inevitable.

More than fifty percent of UV's library book budget is spent on approval plans. The idea behind such an arrangement is to get things quickly. Since approval plans without speedy cataloguing amount simply to 'hurrying up and waiting', vigorous cataloguing has therefore been stressed in this library. Each cataloguer is expected to accomplish a set amount of work each day. This has involved careful study of what procedures to adopt and how long it was practicable to wait for copy.

UV believes that a cataloguer with two or more years' experience should catalogue better than LC for local needs, and that the cataloguers should develop more faith in themselves. For some difficult areas calling for specialist knowledge, such as corporate entries in foreign languages, cataloguers may rely on LC, but when the cataloguing is simple it should cost less to catalogue materials than to control them in backlog.

UV's study of temporary control (FASTCAT) in other universities [though not available to the investigator] revealed that such a device was expensive, and since the cost of higher education in Canada has never been under such scrutiny as it is now, UV felt that cataloguers must be very cost-conscious about their techniques. UV emphasises that cataloguing is only one aspect of the cost of a library book and cataloguing cost should not be out of proportion to the rest.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY

An investigation into what changes are made in LC cataloguing reveals that the main areas of difference lie in the call number and the descriptive cataloguing used in the various libraries. While the variation in classification between LC and the seven libraries is minimal, the use by some of Cutter-Sanborn tables instead of LC author numbers, results in wide disparities between LC call number and those of such libraries. A few examples may illustrate this fact: whereas US classifies only 3 out of 101 titles differently from LC, yet only 4 of its call numbers are identical with LC thus reducing what would have been approximately a 97 per cent call number agreement down to 3.9 per cent. Only 18 out of the 166 entries studied at UA are classified differently from LC (corresponding to 89 per cent), and yet only 3 call numbers of the 148 are identical to LC (1.8 per cent agreement). Even UBC which uses LC author numbers and has only 21 out of 164 entries classified differently from LC (87 per cent agreement) makes 116 of the remaining 143 call numbers differ from LC, (about 29 per cent agreement in call number) by adding edition date to all of them, including first editions - although this is a less serious problem. But the close agreement between LC classification and those of the individual libraries, does not imply the same classification practice among the seven.

In their descriptive cataloguing, the libraries generally adopt a practice similar to LC. Only one of them, UC, experimented with simplified cataloguing (Appendix 2), but this was for only a limited six year period and, since late 1972, has reverted to full cataloguing. There is, however, a general tendency by the libraries to omit the details of illustrative matter, the mention of the author as part of the title statement in single personal author works, the book price which LC now almost always carries as part of the collation, and any indication of either national or first editions. They all cut down on the number of notes as given on LC copy. Although there is a fair measure of consistency among the libraries in the use of the standard bibliographic elements, both within each library and as compared with LC copy, in the use of the less essential elements, there is a consistent pattern in some, while the use of the others is inconsistent. In the choice of main entry, a total of 18 variations (one library has 8 and two others, 3 each) out of 998 main entries studied (98.2 per cent agreement) should be considered very close indeed to LC.

Generally, there exists a close agreement between the subject headings assigned by the libraries and those assigned by the Library of Congress, even with their supplementary use of The List of Canadian Subject Headings. Each library, however, tends to assign more subject headings than LC provides, but the extra in each case (Table 3-6) are not considered very significant in number. Significant, in this regard, is the fact that more specific subject headings are achieved in a few of the libraries by the addition of further sub-divisions to the general headings provided by LC.

Various forms of LC copy are in use in the libraries. Although each library receives the NUC book catalogue with its monthly and annual cumulations, nearly all of them rely on some form of LC copy which arrives faster, in an effort to speed up cataloguing. Even in the case of one library that buys printed catalogue cards, it gets these (printouts from MARC tapes) not directly from LC but from a commercial firm which guarantees a quicker delivery of the cards. One library subscribes to MARC tapes, another to microfiche (MCRS), two make use of proofslips, while four depend on CIP, and one receives the LC-NPAC depository cards as a participant in that programme. While a few of the libraries rely on only one of these faster forms of LC copy, others combine two (and one of them, three) to maximize the fast receipt of LC copy (Table 4-4). The only library that depends solely on the NUC, previously subscribed to the proofslips and is now seriously considering reinstating the subscription. One effect of the ever-increasing use of LC copy, following the trend in the United States,[1] should be a corresponding increase in the use of non-professionals in cataloguing, but this remains to be investigated. Such an investigation promises to be interesting, especially as two of the libraries surveyed state that they also employ non-professionals in original cataloguing.

---

[1] Joseph A. Rosenthal, "Non-professionals and cataloging; a survey of five libraries," Library Resources and Technical Services, XIII (Summer, 1969), pp. 321-31.

Of the faster forms of LC copy used by the libraries, MARC would appear the fastest of all, according to the Payne and McGee study,[2] which maintains that it arrives, in most cases, a week earlier than the proofslips. But MARC has limitations of cost and scope; it appears the most expensive subscription and requires computer software and hardware, both of which are expensive. Until recently, it included only current English monographs, whereas universities acquire materials in virtually all languages, for both teaching and research.

MCRS microfiche and proofslips, on the other hand, are very comprehensive, containing all current LC materials in all languages. The problem with MCRS is that its searching is rather involved. It has to be done in three steps: alphabetizing the books, searching the microfiche, and doing the printout. Any slackening in the pace of one step holds up the others. In addition, both the microfiche and the equipment for reading and printing are more expensive than, for example, the proofslips which require no gadgets at all. MCRS has however this advantage over the proofslips, that no alphabetical filing of cards is involved; the MCRS copy is kept according to years and months covered, and within this arrangement, numerically. Filing and retrieval of the fiches are both easier and faster than in the case of proofslips. Proofslips still appear to be the cheapest and the most comprehensive means, but the overhead cost in filing the slips seems to be high and to negate the initial saving in price.

---

[2] Charles T. Payne and Robert S. McGee, "Comparisons of LC proofslip and MARC tape arrival dates at the University of Chicago Library," Journal of Library Automation, III (June, 1970), pp. 115-17.

The use of Josten's cards, like the use of LC printed cards, should not be as cheap as a proofslip subscription. Because Josten's are printed from MARC, a subscription to Josten's should have the same scope limitation as MARC. All the other forms of getting LC copy (except CIP) still leave a lag in time between the receipt of the book and that of the cataloguing information and necessitate both the creation and the searching of more files. Because both the book and the cataloguing information are received together under CIP programme, CIP eliminates this lag.

To supplement the speed and coverage of the above LC services, and particularly to ensure prompt action on materials with Canadian imprint, which Canadian libraries are more likely to receive before the Library of Congress does, four of the libraries studied participate in a countrywide Shared Cataloguing Programme operating among eight Canadian universities for the mutual exchange of cataloguing information. A significant wastage, however, exists in the programme as it presently operates (Appendix 4).

Because of the loopholes in the operation of the existing programmes, both at the Library of Congress and at the local level, most libraries are compelled to keep some material uncatalogued for varying periods awaiting the receipt of LC copy. The libraries ensure access during this waiting period and while materials are in process, by a 'Books in Process List' to acquaint users with what is available, while two libraries, in addition to this list, also make use of a temporary cataloguing technique (FASTCAT) to bring current materials, immediately on arrival, within reach of their users, in an effort to allow enough time for maximum cataloguing copy to be utilized.

Searching and filing, time-consuming operations, are reduced by a combination of other methods: one library merges both the pre-order and the pre-cataloguing searching in the same unit in the Cataloguing Department, thus ensuring (just as the only library subscribing to MARC tapes does) that bibliographic data is established once only, and then used through the entire processing by Acquisitions, Cataloguing, and any other interested departments. The only library that is a depository of the NPAC cards centralizes all the cataloguing copy it receives from various sources in an attempt to cut down on the number of filing and searching sequences to be handled; it also adopts the principle of dealing with exceptions, for similar reasons. There are two methods that significantly cut down on typing: ticked tracing and yellow highlighting, which are employed by most of the libraries. Although they are mainly used in the subject catalogue to reduce the typing of each subject heading to once only, they can also be applied to the filing of other added entries, such as series.

In those libraries where relevant bibliographic data is supplied to the cataloguer before she starts to catalogue a book, it is discovered that cataloguing is speeded up as a result; in most cases, this data is received from the acquisitions department. Where such data is suspect, alternative devices have been used to guarantee this initial help. Thus one library maintains a distinct descriptive cataloguing unit (mainly nonprofessionals) while another has full-time searchers in the cataloguing department. A third makes use of title-page photography in the same effort to provide cataloguers with cataloguing data, and the impact of this device has been hailed as a dramatic change in original cataloguing. To speed up further the cataloguing process by cutting down on the number of decisions required of every cataloguer, one library makes entry for all series, instead of leaving each cataloguer to unravel, each time, which series entries should be left out.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The high percentage of original cataloguing still going on in these libraries, the existence of backlogs in most of them and the limitations of the Shared Cataloguing Programme of some Canadian universities, invite some attention and recommendations. A cooperative cataloguing arrangement that could process efficiently and quickly current non-United States material acquired by Canadian academic and research libraries would be of great help to these libraries studied. The wasteful duplication of effort in repetitious cataloguing of items in each local library has led librarians to realize that cooperation is no longer an ideal but a necessity if their libraries are to meet the instant needs of their users with the available resources and in the face of rapid growth of information. While the Shared Cataloguing Programme among the eight Canadian universities, as it presently operates, is along this line, it would appear to be too limited in scope to make the required impact. And moreover its wastage rate, as spotlighted by Laskowski,[3] and borne out by statistics (Appendix 4), is significant. The projected help from MCRS to this programme may not make for much improvement, for while its suggested coordination could cut down on the cost of the cards and their postage, it could increase the time-lag between the completion of the cataloguing in a generating library and the receipt of this information in the other participating libraries. In other words, it is most likely that MCRS would create another bottleneck that will make it difficult for cataloguing copy to get to consuming libraries promptly. Simplified cataloguing, tried by UC, and later abandoned, does not seem to have met the needs of readers, although a more reliable verdict on this should be based on a catalogue use study on UC catalogue. Such a study should, in part, answer the question as to whether full cataloguing is necessary for every item in the collection of a university library. The UC experiment suggests, however, there is no easy solution to the problem of speed.

---

[3] Seno Laskowski, "Technical Services in Alberta," Technical Sidelights, III (May, 1972), pp. 31-32.

Network cataloguing appears to be the answer. With a potential for standardized practice, it should be a cooperative cataloguing arrangement, in which each participating library, could,using an on-line system, search the LC MARC tapes at a central base as well as provide further bibliographic input. With the recent introduction of a Canadian MARC by the National Library of Canada, such an arrangement would offer a far greater access to an all-embracing bibliographic data base for each participating library. The use of MARC tapes recommends itself on basis of arrival time and flexibility. This network cataloguing should be a total system using the National Library at Ottawa as a back-up, with three regional centres, one in the East, one in Central Canada and one in Western Canada. Each local library should report items as catalogued to its Regional Centre which should in turn report to the National Library; searching should follow the same procedure.

The Western Canada Regional Centre should include all college, university and research libraries not only in the three provinces covered by this survey, but also in Manitoba, and should be based at US. Although it has relatively small book resources, US has the expertise, the manpower, the software and the hardware required for the efficient operation of such a network. Since a Regional Centre, as herein conceived, should be basically for transmitting information, this lack of bibliographic resources is not a serious handicap as no regional back-up is essential for the efficient operation of this system.

The Centre at Ottawa should maintain a master record of not only the LC and the Canadian MARC tapes, but also the BNB tape, the French MONOCLE, the German and any other national tapes, as a resource with which to handle all questions from local libraries through their Regional Centres. The setting up of regional centres is designed to offset the handicap to cooperation in Canada caused by the enormous distances between institutions and people. Only these Regional Centres (not individual libraries) should then transmit to, or receive information from, the Ottawa Centre so that lines will be dedicated and costs considerably reduced.

An on-line cataloguing system for Western Canada based at US, and operating as one unit of a tripartite national system, using the

National Library as a back-up, might sound an expensive proposal. It is, perhaps, cheaper, and certainly far more rewarding, than the current trend by which each Western Canadian university library will eventually automate its cataloguing system which may then be incompatible with anyone else. Of the seven libraries covered in this survey, four are already closely involved with computer cataloguing. TESA-1 at US is already operational. UA has a different automated system which bears no relation to US. The UC system, though patterned on TESA-1, is not compatible with, dependent on, nor connected to it. The three other libraries will probably follow, since all have access already to the computer. USR has a dedicated line to the MARC tapes at US and yet buys Josten's cards, printed from the same MARC tapes. This appears to be unnecessary duplication, and can only be justified if the cost of Josten's cards is considerably less than similar cards from US. A greater cooperative use of TESA-1 by more university libraries should have reduced costs without increasing the time-lag. Within a network arrangement, using MARC tapes, the other forms of LC in use in these libraries - Josten's cards, proofslips, MCRS microfiche - would not be necessary.

The main disadvantage of a coordinated arrangement seems to be the problem of non-standardization of cataloguing data. This problem was the focus of the first part of this study and is real. The solution lies in a standardization of cataloguing practice among participating libraries.

The attitude of librarians to standardization of all kinds has been ambivalent. They have argued in their writings and speeches for uniform standards and practices, they have set up committees to design standard codes of cataloguing practice, and at the same time nearly every library is non-standard to a greater or lesser degree in many of its operations and records, as some aspects of the first part of this study exemplify. This puts standardization into the category of good things that no one seriously expects to attain and few really want. And yet, the case for standardization is not only strong, but urgent, particularly now that the use of the computer for cataloguing is already a reality. If all libraries in a cooperative arrangement have the same basic operating routines, they can hope for packages of programs - programs that most libraries could only at greater expense develop themselves or to have developed specially for them. Standardization of records is usually considered as of far greater importance than the standardization of systems, just as library records themselves hold the central place in a library - physically as well as administratively. They are the library's chief product and their production usually involves a large number - often a majority - of its senior staff. It can be argued that users will find libraries of all kinds much easier to use if there is more uniformity of records. Few readers, for example, understand classification schemes and few appear to find catalogues at all easy to use. Their difficulties are aggravated if schemes of classification vary, or if numerous modifications of a scheme are used, or if catalogue records for complicated materials like symposia and festschriften, show inconsistency. Attempts in some universities to introduce students to libraries and to familiarize them with library records would have much better chance of success if the knowledge acquired could be valid for all later library experience. There is, of course, no doubt that many modifications, introduced into libraries under short-term pressures, with insufficient forethought, later hardened into tradition which must be upheld at all costs.

Perhaps most convincing is the argument based on cost. The cost of making catalogue entries and constructing classification numbers for large numbers of books quite apart from the actual production of physical records, is one of the biggest items in a library's budget. Should libraries reduce records to a common form, they could take advantage of centralized machine-readable records. An exception could, however, be made for the special collections of individual libraries and such other materials not likely to be acquired by several libraries.

A decision as to which bibliographic elements should conform to such standardized practice could be based on what most users usually look for in the public catalogue. Palmer's,[4] perhaps the most statistically reliable catalogue use study to date,[5] supports the findings of earlier studies that the most used elements of the catalogue entry are title, author, call number, subject headings and date. Catalogue use studies, therefore, agree with CIP practice over the exclusion of both the collation and the imprint, except that the former would like the date included as the only part of the imprint. From cataloguing considerations, especially reckoning on the time and skill that determining each element would demand, much time would be gained if, at least, the classification and subject headings were supplied on a cooperative basis and accepted without modification by each participating library. Each library could then get its experienced assistants to supply both the imprint and the collation in very little time, once the physical volume is on hand.

---

[4] Richard Phillips Palmer, Computerizing the card catalog in the university library: a survey of user requirements. (Littleton, Colo: Libraries Unlimited, 1972), pp. 81-84.

[5] J. McRee Elrod, "Year's work in cataloguing and classification," Library Resources and Technical Services, XVII (Spring, 1973), p. 178.

Classification usually constitutes the most explosive issue in any consideration for standardization. The quest for perfection in this regard is often not tempered with expediency. Even among libraries with a similar problem, the solutions which they offer diverge, as is the case with the seven libraries in this study over the classification of Canadian history, literature and law (Table 3-2). The inadequacies of the various classification schemes of knowledge are too detailed and well known to their users to merit listing here. What recommends the Library of Congress to most libraries in the English speaking world is mainly its backing and services. If the LC classification could be accepted by libraries as a workable shelf arrangement for books, to aid browsing, most of the futile efforts to bring it to perfection in local libraries (often under the guise of adaptation to local usage) would be saved. An encouraging aspect of its service, however, is that the Library of Congress itself has a regular on-going revision programme ("Additions and Changes") which practising librarians anywhere can research into and contribute to, on a cooperative basis. Such obvious shortcomings as exist among Canadian libraries with Canadian history, literature and law, could engage worthwhile effort, not of individual librarians devising solutions for individual libraries, but on a concerted plan, such as that of the Canadian Task Group on Cataloguing Standards,[6] which is working on the nature and content of the bibliographic record for the National Library of Canada's automation project. There is at the moment an on-going revision at the Library of Congress of PS8000, F5000, and KE (Canadian law) and these will be available to the public in 1974. It would appear that if a CACUL[7] committee had handled such an issue before, on the instigation of cataloguers, the Task Group might already have adopted such a committee's report or recommendations, possibly with some minor modifications. With reference to accepting the LC classification scheme as it is, it should also be realized that other approaches exist (and should be created where they are not) to maximize the retrieval of library resources, since one book could be equally relevant to two or more distinct areas of study but can only sit at one spot on the shelf. That browsing actually happens to some degree for certain students and even faculty members who constantly use the stacks of university libraries is beyond question. It may not, however, be accepted as the way scholars commonly become acquainted with the literature in their special fields. Without doubt, systematic bibliographies and book lists, including indexes, abstracts, library catalogues, bulletins and similar listings, are more effective means of informing faculty members of additions to a particular library's collections.

---

[6] Canadian Task Group on Cataloguing Standards. Cataloguing standards: the report of the . . . Group . . . with recommendations to the National Librarian, Dr. Guy Sylvestre. (Ottawa, National Library of Canada, 1972), pp. 22-29.

[7] CACUL is the abbreviated form of 'Canadian Association of College and University Libraries' whose membership are mainly university librarians. It is a division of the Canadian Library Association.

When Ellsworth[8] stated that there is no longer any significance in the names we have used to describe the boundaries of the units of knowledge, he was only emphasizing this twentieth century interdisciplinary trend in education. For the young faculty member, interdepartmental research projects yield the highest returns. The new scholar follows his leads all over the campus, and his books are found in many of the classification divisions of the library. The pursuit of scientific research (and this is true of the social as well as the natural sciences) is becoming less and less compartmentalized, with the advent of mission-oriented or problem-solving research, which draws on several disciplines. Harvard has a behavioral sciences building and programme; but the behavioral sciences include significant aspects of psychology, biology, sociology, political science, economics, anthropology, pediatrics and mathematics. How can any classification system be perfect when the units of knowledge are in a state of flux? 'European Studies' was one of the areas proposed in Great Britain for her new universities by the Home Universities Conference (1960).[9]

---

[8] Ralph Eugene Ellsworth, University library in violent transition, Tenessee University Library Lectures, Nos. XIII-XV, 1961-1963. (Knoxville, Tenn.: University of Tennessee, 1963), pp. 15-22.

[9] James Thompson, "Book classification in new university libraries," Library Association Record, LXV (September, 1963), p. 327.

Programmes in African Studies that span disciplines are equally familiar in African and American university programmes. In fact, there are institutions that have discarded the traditional labels of 'departments' and 'faculties' and have, instead, organized their programmes under such broader units as 'schools' to better reflect this contemporary inter-disciplinary trend in education.

If differences in classification can be rationalized on the contention that different universities should have different emphases, it is hard to find any firm basis for the differences in the book numbers used by libraries, which in this survey is responsible for most of the lack of agreement in call numbers. Because of this wide divergence introduced by its use, the book number could be excluded from the items that should conform to the standardized practice here proposed.

To ensure that this network cataloguing works with the desired speed in the different cataloguing departments labouring under a variety of handicaps and pressures, there could be an arrangement similar to what obtains under the Shared Cataloguing Programme among some Canadian universities. By this arrangement, those books that fall into the area assigned to a particular library should, in that library, receive a rush treatment so that the bibliographic data would be available to the others in a day or two. Where this division of areas follows subject lines, rationalization of collections development should buttress this cooperative cataloguing. But if data base is on-line, there should be no need, in fact, of dividing areas to be covered, among participants.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, it is clear from this survey that the problems of cataloguing in university libraries will not be helped, to any significant extent, by isolated efforts of individual libraries, just as they may not be ultimately solved by mere conventional methods that depend on further increase of library staff and the complexities of their work. Individual libraries could augment cataloguing speed by employing various short-cuts that would remove repetition of processes and thereby cut down on the time involved in such routine operations as searching, typing and filing. But cooperation among similar libraries, within a viable unit, offers the most effective solution to the problem of speed. And a prerequisite for a meaningful cooperation lies in standardization. Because of the need to base practice on accepted national standards, the Canadian Standards Association[10] should, therefore, develop a standard for the presentation of bibliographic data in monographs, in a fashion similar to standards it has already developed for periodicals, and all college, university and research libraries should adhere to these standards in compiling their records. These would be used with the amendments to Library of Congress classification and subject headings accepted by the National Library of Canada. This removal of the urge to reject bibliographic information, or much editorial work on copy before it may be used, will very significantly speed up cataloguing in university libraries.

---

[10] Canadian Task Group on Cataloguing Standards. Cataloguing Standards: the report of the ... Group ... with recommendations to the National Librarian, Dr. Guy Sylvestre, (Ottawa: National Library of Canada, 1972), p. 21.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books.

Burgis, G. C. and Buchinski, E. "MARC at the University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon," in *Automation in Libraries*: papers presented at the CACUL Workshop on Library Automation in a Pre-Conference Workshop of the Canadian Library Association, Hamilton, June, 1970.

Burns, Barrie A. F., and Pridmore, Peter. "TESA-1/Cataloguing: a second look," in *Library Automation in the nation: papers presented at the CACUL Workshop on Library Automation*. Paper 10. University of Saskatchewan, Regina Campus, June 10-12, 1972.

Canadian Task Group on Cataloguing Standards. *Cataloguing standards: the report of the Canadian Task Group on Cataloguing Standards, with recommendations to the National Librarian, Dr. Guy Sylvestre*. Ottawa, National Library, 1972.

Dunkin, Paul S. *Cataloging U.S.A.* Chicago: American Library Association, 1969.

Giljarevskij, R. S. *International distribution of catalogue cards; present situation and future prospects*. Paris: Unesco, 1969.

Jolliffe, J. W., Line, M. B., and Robinson, F. "Why libraries differ - and need they?", in Cox, Nigel S. M. and Grouse, Michael W., eds. *Organization and handling of bibliographic records by computer*. Hamden, Conn.: Archon Books, 1967.

Lapointe, Raoul. *Instant cataloging*. Chicoutimi, Que.: Editions Science Moderne, 1972.

Melcher, Daniel and Saul, Margaret. *Melcher on acquisition*. Chicago: American Library Association, 1971.

Pope, S. Elspeth. *The time-lag in cataloging*. Metuchen, N.J.: The Scarecrow Press, 1973.

Painter, Ann F., ed. *Reader in classification and descriptive cataloging*. Washington, D.C.: National Cash Register Microcard Editions, 1972.

Periodical Articles.

Berkowitz, Albert. "A study of the costs of cataloging books with Library of Congress catalog cards and by original methods." *College and Research Libraries*, XXIV (March, 1963), pp. 126-30.

Birnbaum, Henry. "The availability of Library of Congress catalog cards." *Library Resources and Technical Services*, I (Winter, 1957), pp. 42-49.

Boaz, Ruth L. "Objective: a universal call number." Illinois Libraries, LI (September, 1969), pp. 572-75.

Borden, Elizabeth C. "Cataloging of arrearages at the University of Pennyslvania." Journal of Cataloging and Classification, VII (Fall, 1951), pp. 94-97.

Bregzis, Ritvars. "Some prerequisites to cooperative cataloguing." College and Research Libraries, XXV (November, 1964), pp. 497-500.

"British Columbia Shared Cataloguing." University of British Columbia Library Bulletin, No. XXXIX (January 9, 1969), Vancouver, British Columbia.

Burns, Barrie A. F. "Technical services in Saskatchewan." Technical Sidelights, III (May, 1972), pp. 25-30.

Clapp, Verner W. "CIP in Mid-1970." Library Resources and Technical Services, XV (Winter, 1971), pp. 12-23.

Dawson, John M. "The Library of Congress: its role in cooperative and centralized cataloging." Library Trends, XVI (July, 1967), pp. 85-95.

Dewey, Melvil. "Co-operative cataloging." Library Journal, I (November, 1876), p. 171.

Dix, William S. "Centralized cataloging and university libraries - Title II, Part C, of the Higher Education Act of 1965." Library Trends, XVI (July, 1967), pp. 97-111.

Eastin, Roy B. "Cataloging in Source: the viewpoint of publishers." Library Resources and Technical Services, III (Fall, 1959), pp. 253-56.

Elrod, J. McRee. "Applying the principle of dealing with exceptions." Library Resources and Technical Services, XVI (Summer, 1972), pp. 331-37.

______________. "CACUL Workshop on new techniques in technical services, June 19-20, 1971." Technical Sidelights, II (November, 1971), pp. 18-19.

______________. "A Canadian Program of Shared Cataloguing." Canadian Library Journal, XXVIII (May-June, 1971), pp. 222-24.

______________. "Technical services in British Columbia." Technical Sidelights, III (May, 1972), pp. 19-21.

______________. "The ticked-tracing subject catalogue." Technical Sidelights, No. III (November, 1969), pp. 19-21.

Engelbarts, Rudolf. "Cataloging of accumulated material at UCLA." Journal of Cataloging and Classification, VII (Fall, 1951), pp. 89-94.

_______________, and Williams, Harvey D. "Brieflisting; a method for controlling cataloging arrears." Library Resources and Technical Services, IX (Spring, 1965), pp. 191-199.

Fasana, Paul J. and Fall, James E. "Processing costs for science monographs in the Columbia University libraries." Library Resources and Technical Services, XI (Winter, 1967), pp. 97-114.

Fristoe, Ashby J. "The bitter end." Library Resources and Technical Services, X (Winter, 1966), pp. 91-95.

Fulforth, Charles. "Pub date cataloging." Library Journal, XCV (March 15, 1970), p. 959.

Gore, Daniel. "Further observations on the use of LC classification." Library Resources and Technical Services, X (Fall, 1966), pp. 519-24.

_______________. "In hot pursuit of FASTCAT." Library Journal, XCVII (September 1, 1972), pp. 2693-95.

_______________. "Neglected topic: the cost of classification." Library Journal, LXXXIX (June 1, 1964), pp. 2287-91.

_______________. "Subject cataloging: some considerations of costs." Library Journal, LXXXIX (October 1, 1964), pp. 3699-703.

Hellen, George B., Jr. "An inquiry into Library of Congress cataloging delays." Library Resources and Technical Services, XV (Summer, 1971), pp. 364-79.

Hewitt, Joe A. and Rebuldela, Harriet K. "The Colorado Academic Book Processing Center." Louisiana Library Association Bulletin, XXXIV (Summer, 1971), pp. 49-52.

Hirsch, Felix E. "Why do we need standards?" Library Trends, XXI (October, 1972), pp. 159-63.

Ishimoto, Carol F. "The National Program for Acquisitions and Cataloging: its impact on university libraries." College and Research Libraries, XXXIV (March, 1973), pp. 126-36.

Kagis, Y. "Technical services in Saskatchewan." Technical Sidelights, II (May, 1971), pp. 29-32.

Landram, Christina. "Increasing production in a small university catalog department." Library Resources and Technical Services, XV (Summer, 1971), pp. 380-84.

Laskowski, Seno. "Technical Services in Alberta." Technical Sidelights, III (May, 1972), pp. 31-32.

_______________. "Technical Services in Alberta." Technical Sidelights, IV (May, 1973), pp. 17-19.

Lav, P. "Handling backlogs at the University of British Columbia Library." CACUL Newsletter, No. V (May 15, 1966), p. 18.

Lazorick, Gerald J. and Minder, Thomas L. "A least cost searching sequence." College and Research Libraries, XXV (March, 1964), pp. 126-28.

Lohmann, Otto. "Efforts for international standardization in libraries." Library Trends, XXI (October, 1972), pp. 330-53.

Lunn, Jean. "Shared cataloguing - the consumer in North America." Canadian Library Journal, XXVII (September-October, 1970), pp. 346-50.

Moore, Florence A. "Shared Cataloguing at LC; the TSS open meeting at St. John's." Technical Sidelights, No. III (November, 1969), pp. 2-6.

Morrison, Perry D. and Morrison, Catherine J. "Use of Library of Congress classification decisions in academic libraries - an empirical study." Library Resources and Technical Services, IX (Spring, 1965), pp. 235-42.

Morsh, Lucile M. "Cataloging arrearages in the Library of Congress." Journal of Cataloging and Classification, VII (Fall, 1951), pp. 101-03.

"New developments in cataloguing." University of British Columbia Library Bulletin, No. LXXVIII (February 22, 1972), Vancouver, British Columbia.

Nitecki, Joseph Z. "Speed cataloging: prudence and pitfalls; a report on two years of successful experience in streamlining the cataloging of materials at a major academic library." Library Journal, XCIV (April 1, 1969), pp. 1417-21.

Nixon, Roberta and Bell, Ray. "The UCLA Catalog Supplement." Library Resources and Technical Services, XVII (Winter, 1973), pp. 28-31.

O'Bryant, Matilda Brugh. "Uncataloged books at Brandeis." Library Resources and Technical Services, I (Winter, 1957), pp. 40-42.

Payne, Charles T. and McGee, Robert S. "Comparisons of LC proofslip and MARC tape arrival dates at the University of Chicago Library." Journal of Library Automation, III (June, 1970), pp. 115-17.

Petriwsky, Eugene and Hewitt, Joe. "Producing card copy from book catalogs with Xerox Model 4 camera." Library Resources and Technical Services, XIII (Summer, 1969), pp. 361-65.

Piggot, Mary. "Uniformity in descriptive cataloging." Libri, XIII (1963), pp. 45-54.

Piternick, George. "University Library arrearages." Library Resources and Technical Services, XIII (Winter, 1969), pp. 102-14.

Raymond, Boris and Francis, Derek. "Is this trip really necessary or should university libraries do their own original cataloguing?" Canadian Library, XXV (July, 1968), pp. 35-37.

Schaeffer, Rudolf F. "Delight and pitfalls of subject cataloging." Library Resources and Technical Services, XIV (Winter, 1970), pp. 98-108.

Scilken, Marvin H. "Backlog to frontlog." Library Journal, XCIV (September 15, 1969), pp. 3014-15.

"Shared Cataloguing Programme." University of British Columbia Library Bulletin, No. LXVI (July 6, 1971), Vancouver, British Columbia.

Skipper, James E. "The characteristics of cataloging in research libraries." Association of Research Libraries. Minutes of the 68th Meeting. July 9, 1966. New York City. Appendix 1, p. 58-83.

______________. Future implementations of Title IIC, Higher Education Act of 1965. Library Resources and Technical Services, XI (Winter, 1967), pp. 46-49.

______________. "International implications of the Shared Cataloging Program; an introductory statement." Libri, XVII (1967), pp. 270-75.

Stevens, Norman D., ed. "The National Program for Acquisitions and Cataloging: a progress report on developments under Title IIC of the Higher Education Act of 1965." Library Resources and Technical Services, XII (Winter, 1968), pp. 17-28.

Sylvestre, Guy. "Towards standardization of catalogues in Canada." Canadian Library Journal, XXX (May-June, 1973), pp. 252-60.

Taylor, G. M. "It will cost more tomorrow: an economically feasible scheme for classification." Library Resources and Technical Services, XVI (Winter, 1972), pp. 82-92.

"Title added entries." University of British Columbia Library Bulletin, No. LXXXIX (October 3, 1972), Vancouver, British Columbia.

"Tracing of subject and series cards." University of British Columbia Library Bulletin, No. LXX (September 29, 1971), Vancouver, British Columbia.

Treyz, Joseph H. "The Cards-With-Books Program." American Library Association Bulletin, LVII (May, 1963), pp. 433-34.

Trotier, Arnold H. "Cataloging in Source: the story up to now." Illinois Libraries, XLI (June, 1959), pp. 426-31.

Truelson, Stanley D. "The need to standardize descriptive cataloging." Bulletin of the Medical Library Association, LVII (January, 1969), pp. 21-27.

U.S. Library of Congress. Processing Department. Cataloging-in-Publication. Progress Report. Nos. 1-4, 1972-1973.

Voos, Henry. "Revision of the current Library of Congress catalog card format." Library Resources and Technical Services, XI (Spring, 1967), pp. 167-72.

Waters, Samuel T. and Costabile, Salvatore L. "The proof of the pudding: using LC proofslips." College and Research Libraries, XXVIII (March, 1967), pp. 87-91.

Watkins, David R. "Standards for university libraries." Library Trends, XXI (October, 1972), pp. 190-203.

Weimerskirch, Philip J. "The use of title-page photography in cataloging." Library Resources and Technical Services, XII (Winter, 1968), pp. 37-46.

Welsh, William J. "Report on LC plans for Cataloging-in-Publication." Library Resources and Technical Services, XV (Winter, 1971), pp. 23-27.

Wheeler, Joseph L. "Top priority for Cataloging-in-Source." Library Journal, XCIV (September 15, 1969), pp. 3007-13.

_______________. "Why we must have Cataloging-in-Publication." Library Resources and Technical Services, XV (Winter, 1971), pp. 6-12.

Wood, Amy F. and Maloy, Miriam C. "The Library of Congress card service: sixty-five libraries comment." Library Journal, LXII (October 1, 1937), pp. 726-30.

"Yellow highlighting on catalog cards." University of British Columbia Library Bulletin, Nos. LXX, LXXXII, LXXXIX (September 29, 1971, May 26, 1972; October 3, 1972).

Unpublished Materials.

Baldwin, Paul E. Shared cataloguing: cost study; an interim report. (Unpublished October, 1972).

Ng, Tung King. Impact of the shared cataloging program on the processing of Japanese language materials; report on a survey presented at the annual conference of the Committee on East Asian Libraries, Association for Asian Studies, San Francisco, April 5, 1970.

APPENDIX 1

May 25, 1973

Dear Sir/Madam:

I am a graduate student working towards a Master's degree in Library Science (MLS) at the School of Library Science, University of Alberta. For my thesis, I am conducting a survey of cataloguing practice of the university libraries in Western Canada. The purpose of this study is to identify and compare the various cataloguing methods employed by the different libraries to speed-up the cataloguing of their materials and to find out what changes are made in LC cataloguing in each institution.

In order to provide the required data, it is hoped that participating libraries will answer all questions carefully and completely. If you can only give an estimate in response to any question asking for statistical information, please label as an estimate. Other aspects of the survey will be covered during an on-site visit; the Director of my school will be contacting you regarding possible dates for this visit. If you so desire, a summary of the questionnaire results will be made available to you, upon the completion of this study.

A stamped self-addressed envelope is enclosed for your convenience. If possible, please return one copy of the completed questionnaire to me before 7th June 1973; the duplicate copy is for your file.

Thank you very much for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Raphael C. Nwamefor,
Student,
School of Library Science.

RCN:grs

Encl.-

DEFINITIONS

A professional should have a library school degree or its equivalent and is mainly concerned with the more intellectual aspects of cataloguing. Anyone else should be regarded as a nonprofessional, for the purpose of this questionnaire.

Cataloguing refers to the intellectual work that goes into getting a book ready for the shelf. It includes descriptive cataloguing, classification and subject heading work.

The interval between the receipt of a book and its complete cataloguing is considered normal when the cataloguing involves the use of only the standard procedures. It excludes rush cataloguing, simplified cataloguing, temporary cataloguing, fast cataloguing and the cataloguing of duplicate copies, but includes the use of LC copy with revision.

Rush cataloguing: A book for rush cataloguing is regarded as a priority item so that instead of taking its normal turn in the process, an attempt is made to get it ready for the open stack with the shortest possible delay.

Simplified cataloguing is the process of preparing entries for a catalogue without the full description or detailed identification of the book.

Temporary cataloguing is the process of preparing entries for a catalogue without the full description or detailed identification of the book, in order to get it into circulation while waiting for LC cataloguing information. Temporary cataloguing differs from simplified cataloguing in that the latter is considered permanent.

Cataloguing policy is a local cataloguing decision guiding the cataloguing practice of the library concerned. It differs from cataloguing rules which have a far wider application, national or international.

Materials, as used in this questionnaire, refer only to books. A 'book' should be regarded as a printed and published monograph of at least forty-nine pages excluding the cover pages. The data demanded in this questionnaire exclude serials, nonbook materials or government publications.

A SURVEY OF CATALOGUING PRACTICE IN WESTERN CANADIAN UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES

QUESTIONNAIRE

PRELIMINARY INFORMATION

1. Name of library

2. Name and position of officer completing the questionnaire

3. Total number of staff (in full time equivalents) in any way concerned with cataloguing, including staff of departmental or other subsidiary libraries who are in any way concerned with this activity.

   Professionals ________ Nonprofessionals ________ Total ________

4. Approximate size of library collection as would be reported to Statistics Canada

   ____
   ____
   ____
   ____

5. What statistics are kept by the Cataloguing Department? (Please send copies of any forms used)

6. What units are used to measure output of cataloguing? (As far as possible, please define the units used)

7. Give an estimate of the number of titles (NOT VOLUMES) catalogued by an average cataloguer in one normal working month between January and April 1973 (this should include items revised and recatalogued)

   Professional ______________ Nonprofessional ______________

NORMAL CATALOGUING

8. What form(s) of LC copy do you use and to what extent does your library revise it (them)?

9. What is the normal interval between the receipt of new material in the library and its appearance on the public shelves? ______________________________

10. What is the normal interval between the receipt of new material in the cataloguing department and its appearance on the public shelves? ______________________________

11. Do you feel there is need to cut down on the length of the interval referred to in Question 10 above? Yes _____ No _____

12. What is the extent of your cataloguing backlog?

13. (a) If there is no backlog, how is this accomplished?

(b) If you have a backlog, please list and briefly describe all the means you employ to cut it down.

14. What procedures do you use to speed up normal cataloguing - e.g. Shared Cataloguing, Cataloguing-In-Publication, etc.?

15. In the following table, please check the appropriate box to indicate the approximate percentage of catalogue cards obtained from each of the specified sources for the first four months of this year:

(The sum of 1-6 should equal 100%) Estimate Percentage

	10% or less	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%
Catalogue cards purchased from 1) Library of Congress										
2) Wilson										
3) Other sources (please specify)										
Catalogue cards prepared locally 4) From LC copy (in all its forms)										
5) From other copy (please specify)										
6) Original cataloguing										

16. If your library buys printed cards, please answer the following questions:

a) In general, when are the cards ordered? (Check as applicable)

i) When books are ordered ____________
ii) Between ordering and receiving ____________
iii) After books are received ____________

b) Please specify the number of weeks or months that it generally takes, on the average, to receive the cards: ________weeks ________months

c) Do you usually accept the printed cards without revision?

Yes _____ No _____

d) If no, please specify what changes are generally made.

17. Does the cataloguer make use of any prior work done by other people

(a) in the cataloguing department? Yes _____ No_____
(b) in the acquisitions department? Yes _____ No_____
(c) Others (please specify) __________________ Yes _____ No_____

Please indicate the kind of service and the extent of use.

ORIGINAL CATALOGUING

18. (a) Are there special areas where you do not use LC copy, that is, where your practice is to do original cataloguing of every item received? Yes _____ No_____

(b) Please specify such area(s)

(c) What advantages (to your library) has such a practice, over the use of LC copy?

19. What procedures do you use to speed up original cataloguing? (Please give brief details and indicate follow-up procedures where applicable)

DETAILS OF CATALOGUING ENTRIES

20. (a) Do you follow a written cataloguing policy: Yes ____ No ____

(b) If yes, please send a copy, if possible, when returning this questionnaire.

21. (a) Do you follow any published code of cataloguing rules? Yes _____ No _____

(b) If yes, which?

22. The code of descriptive cataloguing rules is followed (check as appropriate)

(i) just as given ____________________
(ii) with some modifications ____________________
(iii) with extensive modifications ____________________

23. What secondary or added entries do you normally make?

24. (a) Do you keep to a stipulated maximum number of such secondary headings per title in the author (or name) catalogue? Yes _____ No _____

(b) If yes, how many? __________

CLASSIFICATION

25. (a) Which classification scheme(s) do you use? State edition where applicable.

(b) If you use more than one classification scheme, please state which part of the collections is classified by which scheme.

26. (a) Is the classification scheme you use followed (check as appropriate)

(i) with no modification or expansion? ___________
(ii) with some modification or expansion? ___________
(iii) with extensive modification or expansion? ___________

(b) State subject areas involved and indicate the specific modification or expansion.

27. Do you use any author numbers supplementary to that given in the published edition of the classification scheme(s)? Yes _____ No _____

If yes, which?

SUBJECT HEADINGS

28. (a) If your subject heading work is based on a specific list, state which list you use, indicating the edition as well.

(b) If not, what method do you use in subject heading work?

29. (a) Do you use any supplementary list(s)? Yes _____ No _____

(b) If yes, indicate which.

30. (a) About how many subject headings, on the average, do you assign to a book? ________________________________

(b) Do you keep to a stipulated maximum number of such headings per title? Yes _____ No _____

(c) If yes, how many? ______________

31. Would you consider the average number of subject headings you assign per title (check as appropriate)

(i) limited? ____________
(ii) satisfactory? ____________
(iii) excessive? ____________

Summary of questionnaire

Copy desired ____________
No copy desired ____________

THANK YOU.

APPENDIX 2

THE UNIVERSITY OF CALGARY LIBRARY

SIMPLIFIED CATALOGUING GUIDE

ORIGINAL CATALOGUING

Author's dates: Leave off except where known to conflict with another author, e.g., Alexander Dumas, father and son.

Imprint: Date only, taken from title-page or verso of title-page. Square brackets only if supplied and doubtful.

Collation: Volumes only. In the case of open entry use vols. followed by (in progress) when complete cataloguer will be responsible for closing entry and drawing a line through (in progress)

Series note: Out.

Notes: At the discretion of the cataloguer. In general no note for bibliography or contents.

Tracings: Subject headings need not be subdivided for form divisions, with the following exceptions:-

1. Bibliography
2. Bio-bibliography
3. Dictionaries
4. Directories
5. History
6. Indexes
7. Periodicals

Added entries: Continue to make translators and editors in P classification only. All others out. Title added entries to remain.

CATALOGUING WITH LC CARDS

Continue to use imprint and collation as now. Card should not give misinformation e.g., if publisher different from the copy in hand a line should be drawn through it. Do not have it erased. Leave series note on, but delete series added entries. Treat as with original cataloguing for other tracings.

New Editions and Reprints

A new edition is defined as, any issue in which the text has been added to or altered. The text for this purpose includes all prefatory material, footnotes, appendices, etc.

Any other issue, i.e., one in which the text is unaltered from a previous printing, is considered a reprint, even if issued by a new publisher or in a new format and giving new pagination.

If two copies of the same text are in the library they will be catalogued as duplicate copies or copy 1 and copy 2, even if in different formats and issued by different publishers.

APPENDIX 3

THE UNIVERSITY OF CALGARY LIBRARY

PREPARING CATALOGUING COPY

AUTHOR'S DATE:

Omit except when known to conflict with another author, e.g., Alexander Dumas, father and son. Or, when the author is a king, queen, president, or pope.

IMPRINT:

Place of publication, publisher, date. Date is taken from title page or verso of title page. Use square brackets only if date is supplied or doubtful.

COLLATION:

Numbered pages, illustrations, map, size.

SERIES NOTES:

Are put on all books

Make series for:

1. All university series
2. Publications of learned societies
3. Numbered and unnumbered series with limited subject scope
4. Government publications
5. Publishers series when publisher's name is not part of series title.

NOTES:

1. For translations if not indicated in the title paragraph
2. For changes in title
3. For books with alternate call numbers. E.g., Another copy

4. Xerox reproductions
5. Limited editions. E.g., Number 20 of a limited edition of 50 copies

It is not generally necessary to make contents notes, or notes for bibliography.

TRACINGS:

The following form divisions are not used with subject headings.

1. Addresses, essays, lectures
2. Collected works
3. (Collections)
4. Congresses
5. Handbooks, manuals, etc.
6. Outlines, syllabi, etc.
7. Sources

MAKE SERIES ADDED ENTRIES FOR:

1. All university series
2. Publications of learned societies
3. Numbered and unnumbered series with limited subject scope
4. Government publications
5. Publishers' series when publisher's name is not part of the series title.

APPENDIX 4

CANADIAN UNIVERSITIES SHARED CATALOGUING PROGRAMME: STATISTICS

Key to symbols used.

CaBViV : University of Victoria Library
CaBVaU : University of British Columbia Library
CaOTY : York University Library
CaBVaS : Simon Fraser University Library
CaOWtU : University of Waterloo Library
CaAEU : University of Alberta Library
CaACU : University of Calgary Library
CaOOU : University of Ottawa Library
CaNfSM : Memorial University of Newfoundland Library
CaMWU : University of Manitoba Library
CaOWA : University of Windsor Library

CANADIAN UNIVERSITIES SHARED CATALOGUING PROGRAMME: STATISTICS

MEMORIAL UNIVERSITY OF NEWFOUNDLAND

SHARED CATALOGUING PROGRAMME: STATISTICS MAY 72 - APRIL 73

No. of cards (masters) received.

Month	CaAEU	CaBVaU	CaOWtU	CaOTY	CaBViV	CaOOU	CaMWU	CaACU	CaBVas	Total
May	145	431	91	63	197	99	33	--	128	1187
June	188	399	101	53	152	108	57	--	26	1084
July	92	332	85	358	189	91	49	93	11	1300
Aug.	206	488	85	167	199	49	67	27	54	1342
Sept.	152	340	77	215	176	59	90	--	40	1149
Oct.	192	375	103	196	208	69	57	258	29	1487
Nov.	140	351	92	169	200	66	46	81	35	1180
Dec.	114	252	115	172	144	48	53	89	16	1003
Jan.	76	423	65	206	223	108	61	3	32	1197
Feb.	139	335	88	138	241	120	63	186	15	1325
Mar.	151	345	75	165	266	153	93	97	6	1351
Apr.	117	243	87	223	215	105	92	62	4	1148

No. of cards used:

May	10	20	7	7	10	5	2	--	10	71
June	1	29	13	5	13	3	5	--	9	78
July	4	5	8	8	6	1	4	--	1	37
Aug.	14	16	15	19	18	6	15	--	1	104
Sept.	2	7	3	4	6	1	6	--	1	30
Oct.	9	9	10	15	14	1	6	1	2	67

SHARED CATALOGUING PROGRAMME: STATISTICS MAY 72 - APRIL 73 (Continued)

No. of cards used:

Nov.	22	16	15	32	22	9	13	1	8	138
Dec.	6	16	3	20	5	--	2	--	1	53
Jan.	31	51	24	62	33	4	9	1	8	223
Feb.	28	37	18	109	35	3	15	1	5	251
Mar.	10	25	6	36	8	6	14	1	1	107
Apr.	8	11	7	57	12	1	8	4	1	109

No. of cards matched with proof slips.*

Month	CaAEU	CaBVaU	CaOWtU	CaOTY	CaBViV	CaOOU	CaMWU	CaACU	CaBVaS	Total
May	64	180	30	23	81	19	5	--	33	435
June	100	187	36	12	82	28	20	--	7	472
July	37	142	30	53	69	26	6	26	4	393
Aug.	67	211	35	60	70	24	16	6	30	519
Sept.	67	202	43	60	70	31	35	2	11	521
Oct.	126	212	29	24	69	28	19	74	9	590
Nov.	68	108	25	20	52	11	11	29	13	337
Dec.	31	125	32	24	40	12	10	29	4	307
Jan.	49	200	36	32	72	25	16	25	15	470
Feb.	76	86	31	29	92	29	15	55	11	397
Mar.	37	200	32	21	110	24	19	32	3	379
Apr.	51	146	38	171	90	30	31	35	3	595

*As of April, 1973, this refers to Canadiana Proof slips. At that time we acquired the MCRS system and are no longer maintaining an LC proof slip file.

No. of cards sent:

May	41
June	34
July	13
Aug.	9
Sept.	20
Oct.	12

Nov.	8
Dec.	7
Jan.	10
Feb.	7
Mar.	11
Apr.	29

SHARED CATALOGUING PROGRAMME: YORK UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES 1972/73

Number of cards matched with LC at point of filing:

Month	CaBVaS	CaBVaU	CaBViV	CaOWtU	CaAEU	CaACU	CaMWU	CaOOU	CaNfSM	Total
May	1	5	1	-	1	-	-	-	1	9
June	2	3	1	1	1	-	-	-	2	10
July	-	5	2	2	2	3	-	2	1	17
Aug.	-	1	1	-	3	-	-	-	-	5
Sept.	-	5	-	1	1	-	-	1	-	8
Oct.	-	5	2	3	4	7	2	2	-	25
Nov.	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3
Dec.	4	1	4	-	3	2	2	4	-	20
Jan.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
Feb.	-	2	3	1	-	2	-	-	-	8
Mar.	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	2
Apr.	-	1	4	-	-	7	-	-	-	12
TOTAL	7	31	19	8	15	21	5	9	4	119

Number of cards matched with LC at point of cataloguing:

Month	CaBVaS	CaBVaU	CaBViV	CaOWtU	CaAEU	CaACU	CaMWU	CaOOU	CaNfSM	Total
May	4	31	35	33	15	1	1	2	2	124
June	2	12	15	8	23	-	1	-	1	62
July	2	3	5	8	8	-	2	1	-	29
Aug.	4	11	28	16	19	1	8	10	-	97
Sept.	3	8	9	7	11	-	1	6	1	46
Oct.	3	15	28	20	16	1	2	3	3	91
Nov.	8	28	31	22	22	1	7	8	4	131
Dec.	3	16	19	10	18	-	7	6	3	82
Jan.	5	17	9	9	14	3	3	9	-	69
Feb.	1	20	15	8	12	7	8	6	3	80
Mar.	1	15	16	7	24	5	6	3	-	81
Apr.	1	13	10	7	10	16	6	3	-	66
TOTAL	37	189	220	155	192	35	52	61	17	958

SHARED CATALOGUING PROGRAMME: YORK UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES 1972-73

Number of cards (masters) received from:

Month	CaBVaS	CaBVaU	CaBViV	CaOWtU	CaAEU	CaACU	CaMWU	CaOOU	CaNfSM	Total
May	22	388	187	91	135	-	33	84	45	983
June	26	398	155	101	196	-	57	108	36	1,077
July	11	352	146	108	83	106	65	105	13	989
Aug.	54	477	180	61	206	13	66	35	9	1,101
Sept.	56	796	79	77	133	-	73	74	20	1,308
Oct.	29	963	209	98	195	258	67	84	9	1,912
Nov.	35	698	201	91	137	81	36	66	11	1,356

SHARED CATALOGUING PROGRAMME: YORK UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES 1972-73
(Continued)

Number of cards (masters) received from:

Dec.	16	732	207	114	113	90	53	48	-	1,380
Jan.	10	752	160	65	77	3	61	108	9	1,245
Feb.	36	649	234	88	145	185	63	120	7	1,547
Mar.	6	442	253	75	133	97	92	153	12	1,263
Apr.	4	524	215	85	114	62	92	106	23	1,225
TOTAL	305	7171	2246	1054	1667	895	758	1091	201	15,388

Number of cards (masters) used for original cataloguing:

Month	CaBVaS	CaVaU	CaBViV	CaOWtU	CaAEU	CaACU	CaMWU	CaOOU	CaNfSM	Total
May	4	10	21	11	[illegible]	-	2	4	1	60
June	-	5	2	18	15	-	1	4	2	47
July	2	13	5	6	14	1	4	-	2	47
Aug.	-	14	27	7	27	4	4	7	3	98
Sept.	1	11	6	9	7	-	1	1	2	38
Oct.	3	21	9	4	7	-	7	4	1	56
Nov.	2	61	56	15	31	8	12	12	6	203
Dec.	1	19	9	13	12	2	6	6	2	70
Jan.	2	43	30	18	24	5	17	4	3	146
Feb.	2	73	42	27	37	15	15	14	1	226
Mar.	5	66	51	26	31	13	18	10	1	221
Apr.	2	46	32	37	29	19	9	6	1	181
TOTAL	24	382	290	191	241	67	96	72	25	1,388

SHARED CATALOGUING PROGRAMME: YORK UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES 1972/73

Number of cards (masters) sent to other institutions:

May	57	November	197
June	97	December	145
July	346	January	213
August	176	February	148
September	185	March	155
October	158	April	205
		TOTAL	2,082

UNIVERSITY OF WATERLOO

SHARED CATALOGUING PROGRAMME: ANNUAL STATISTICS

May 1972 - April 1973

	CaBViV	CaBVaU	CaOTY	CaBVas	CaAEU	CaOOU	CaACU	CaNfSM	CaMWU	TOTAL	% of Totals Received
No. of cards (masters) received from:	2493	7473	2169	272	1755	1027	682	372	976	17219	
No. of S.C.C. for which P.S. was already available:	123	135	54	60	68	38	78	12	14	582	3.38
No. of S.C.C. bumped by P.S. later:	682	722	132	38	342	190	182	64	127	2479	14.40
No. of S.C.C. (masters) used:	597	973	804	44	428	72	192	57	198	3365	19.54

No. of titles given original cataloguing by CaOWTU: 1,044

UNIVERSITY OF OTTAWA

SHARED CATALOGUING PROGRAMME: STATISTICS JANUARY-JULY 1973

Number of cards (masters) received from:

Month	CaAEU	CaBVaU	CaACU	CaMWU	CaNSM	CaBVaS	CaBViV	CaOWtU	CaOTY	Total
Jan.	62	1041	3	71	10	-	259	96	239	1781
Feb.	303	673	87	65	7	-	243	88	132	1398
Mar.	227	566	23	83	12	-	268	49	170	1398
Apr.	97	524	63	93	21	-	181	73	211	1293
May	75	497	216	52	21	-	163	84	128	1236
June	97	425	-	41	9	-	190	72	145	979
										8085

Number of cards (masters) used:

Jan.	14	27	5	7	-	-	22	12	73	160
Feb.	9	12	3	-	-	-	10	4	40	78
Mar.	9	13	-	4	1	-	6	5	8	46
Apr.	6	9	-	3	-	-	7	-	6	31
May	9	13	-	3	1	-	24	3	20	73
June	5	9	2	4	1	-	5	7	4	37
										425

Number of cards sent by COU:

Janvier	---	129
Fevrier	---	100
Mars	---	174
Avril	---	96
Mai	---	146
Juin	---	264
		909

SHARED CATALOGUING PROGRAMME: UBC UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES

Number of cards (masters) received from:

Month	CaAEU	CaBVaS	CaNfSM	CaBViV	CaOWtU	CaMWU	CaOTY	CaACU	CaOOU	Total
Jan.	83	32	10	225	103	48	244	3	82	830
Feb.	146	15	7	260	87	74	122	184	72	967
Mar.	143	6	12	215	75	89	175	89	114	918
Apr.	118	4	23	173	85	88	217	62	90	860
May	58	4	18	143	84	52	132	217	94	802
June	97	-	9	184	71	41	117	1	134	654

Number of cards used:

Month	CaAEU	CaBVaS	CaNfSM	CaBViV	CaOWtU	CaMWU	CaOTY	CaACU	CaOOU	Total
Jan.	29	13	1	119	30	7	49	15	3	266
Feb.	35	16	5	166	36	9	86	33	1	387
Mar.	13	8	-	79	14	3	32	10	2	161
Apr.	14	4	-	93	9	5	43	5	4	177
May	28	10	5	106	10	10	33	9	4	215
June	9	10	4	101	18	7	90	7	4	250

SHARED CATALOGUING PROGRAMME: UNIVERSITY OF CALGARY

1972-1973

Number of cards used:

Month	CaBVaS	CaBVaU	CaBViV	CaOWtU	CaAEU	CaOTY	CaMWU	CaOOU	CaNfSM	Total
Apr.	2	4	16	14	22	3	-	4	3	68
May	1	7	12	8	13	2	1	7	-	51
June	1	10	5	7	9	5	2	10	1	50
July	1	6	5	2	6	-	1	2	1	24
Aug.	3	3	10	3	5	-	-	-	-	24
Sept.	-	5	2	1	7	2	1	-	2	20
Oct.	1	18	9	7	5	15	1	2	2	60
Nov.	3	24	15	15	15	5	3	5	-	85
Dec.	1	20	13	10	18	13	10	1	-	86
Jan.	3	20	17	14	16	17	10	2	5	104
Feb.	4	13	25	12	14	64	3	4	1	140
Mar.	4	57	13	18	23	32	10	3	2	162
TOTAL	24	187	142	111	153	158	42	40	17	874

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

SHARED CATALOGUING PROGRAMME: STATISTICS

April 1972 - March 1973

Number of cards (masters) Received From:

Month	CaBVaS	CaBVaU	CaBViV	CaWtU	CaOTY	CaACU	CaMWU	CaOOU	CaNfSM	Total
Apr.	111	125	225	111	26	12	19	98	25	752
May	22	399	199	91	64	-	33	99	45	952
June	26	350	162	101	35	-	59	95	28	856
July	11	342	211	81	390	93	51	115	18	1312
Aug.	48	483	175	83	165	27	67	49	11	1108
Sept.	40	409	161	76	188	-	75	42	15	1006
Oct.	35	670	198	74	163	198	60	92	15	1505
Nov.	35	903	188	92	189	-	46	67	34	1554
Dec.	16	870	260	83	130	89	33	90	7	1578
Jan.	33	1132	192	72	272	3	56	109	10	1879
Feb.	17	732	283	91	151	103	99	127	9	1612
Mar.	4	702	324	89	202	101	119	157	13	1711
TOTAL	398	7117	2578	1044	1975	626	717	1140	230	15825

SHARED CATALOGUING PROGRAMME: STATISTICS (Continued)

Number of Masters Used:

Month	CaBVaS	CaBVaU	CaBViV	CaWtU	CaOTY	CaACU	CaMWU	CaOOU	CaNfSM	Total
Apr.	19	15	21	27	6	11	5	7	1	112
May	3	27	47	18	8	1	5	7	1	117
June	4	49	30	16	4	1	8	4	1	117
July	2	53	23	18	36	3	10	5	5	155
Aug.	3	67	26	21	58	1	4	2	1	183
Sept.	3	37	20	14	37	-	7	11	1	130
Oct.	1	83	34	20	74	12	15	6	3	248
Nov.	2	87	58	29	94	20	20	5	5	320
Dec.	3	55	23	24	157	7	8	3	-	280
Jan.	1	53	21	30	78	10	10	4	-	207
Feb.	6	60	34	5	54	-	9	2	4	174
Mar.	3	64	38	15	42	8	10	4	-	184
TOTAL	50	650	375	237	648	74	111	60	22	3227

Number of Cards (Masters) Sent to Other Institutions:

Month	No.	1,608	
Apr.	172	Oct.	182
May	99	Nov.	174
June	202	Dec.	117
July	99	Jan.	101
Aug.		Feb.	186
Sept.	154	Mar.	122

VITA

NAME: RAPHAEL CHIANUMBA NWAMEFOR

PLACE OF BIRTH: NRI, AWKA DIVISION, NIGERIA

YEAR OF BIRTH: 1935

POST SECONDARY EDUCATION AND DEGREES:

University of Nigeria, Nsukka, Nigeria

1960 - 1963 B.A. (History)

University of Ibadan, Ibadan, Nigeria

1963 - 1964 Diploma in Librarianship

HONOURS AND AWARDS:

Federal Government of Nigeria Undergraduate Scholarship

1961 - 1963

Federal Government of Nigeria Postgraduate Scholarship

1963 - 1964

Canadian International Development Agency Scholarship

1972 - 1973.